DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 089 EA 022 631

AUTHOR Slater, Jana Kay
TITLE Middle Grades Reform in California: Regional Processes: Interim Evaluation. Technical Report 2. Draft.
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 193p.; For related documents, see EA 022 629-630.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Objectives; Institutional Characteristics; *Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Middle Schools; Networks; School Demography; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The California agenda for middle-grade reform is based on 10 regional networks, each composed of 1 foundation school and approximately 10 partnership schools. The second in a series of program evaluations, Technical Report 2 presents regional level information on the first 2 years of implementation of the middle-grade reform proposals, 1988-89 and 1989-90, with a focus on leadership structures and regional accomplishments. The report begins with an overview of the state's reform plan and describes regional implementation strategies. Detailed descriptions of processes and activities occurring in each of the 10 regions are provided in 10 separate appendices, which are based on information collected from interviews and site observations. Statistical tables on school and student characteristics and individual schools' CAP percentile ranks are included in each regional description. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED340089

DRAFT

Middle Grades Reform in California

Regional Processes

Interim Evaluation: Technical Report 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Sacramento, 1990

EA 022 631

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRAFT

Middle Grades Reform in California

Regional Processes

Interim Evaluation: Technical Report 2

Prepared by
Jana Kay Slater
Special Studies and Evaluation Reports Unit
Program Evaluation and Research Division

Publishing Information

This report was prepared by Jana Kay Slater, Consultant, Special Studies and Evaluation Reports Unit, Program Evaluation and Research Division, California Department of Education. It was published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California (mailing address: P.O. Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720). Any questions regarding the report should be directed to Jana Kay Slater; telephone (916) 323-6376.

The report was distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act and *Government Code* Section 11096.

1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
Major Findings	3
Recommendations	8
INTRODUCTION	10
BACKGROUND ON THE CALIFORNIA AGENDA FOR REFORM IN MIDDLE GRADE EDUCATION	11
Regional Networks	12
Partnership Schools	13
Foundation Schools	13
Administration	14
Designation of Regional Boundaries	15
REGIONAL OBJECTIVES, LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	16
Reform Objectives	16
The Big Picture	17
Leadership Structures	18
Statewide Leadership	18
Foundation School Leadership	19
Individual Leaders	21
Committees	21
The Effect of Staff Turnover	23
Significant Accomplishments	26
Staff Development	26
Communication	29
Linkages	31
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
APPENDICES	38
REGION A: NORTH CENTRAL	40
REGION B: SOUTH CENTRAL	53
REGION C: RIVERSIDE/SAN BERNARDINO	64
REGION D: SAN DIEGO/IMPERIAL COUNTIES	76
REGION E: ORANGE COUNTY	88
REGION F: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	99
REGION G: LOS ANGELES SUBURBS	115

CONTENTS (Continued)

REGION H: SOUTH BAY/MONTEREY. 126

REGION I: EAST BAY/SAN JOAQUIN. 137

REGION J: NORTH COAST 147

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California agenda for reform in middle grades was proposed in the 1987 report of the California Middle Grade Task Force. Entitled *Caught in the Middle: Educational Reform for Young Adolescents in California Public Schools* (CIM), this report represents the efforts of 36 task force members and eight other persons throughout the state who served on six regional advisory panels. The report contains 102 recommendations for improving middle grade education and proposes an agenda that is predicated on the premise that optimal reform will result from "partnerships" between schools, each learning from and helping one another. Further, the agenda strongly supports the notion of local control; that is, schools within a partnership are in the best position to diagnose their own weaknesses and to propose needed reform strategies.

In 1988, California implemented the agenda by designating ten regional networks, each comprised of one Foundation School and approximately ten Partnership Schools. All schools in each regional network are considered "partners" dedicated to achieving state-of-the-art education in middle grades. Each Partnership School is given the charge of implementing site-specific reform efforts for their students in the middle grades. Each Foundation School, selected for its potential to model excellence and to facilitate the reform efforts of Partnership Schools in its regional network, is to provide assistance to schools in its region. Each Network received funding from private foundations (the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan) to distribute among Partnership Schools in their region ($35,500 in 1988-89; $41,600 in 1989-90). Supplemental funding was also provided by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation of New York. Regional networks became functional

during the 1988-89 school year and will continue to function through the 1990-91 school year.

Technical Report 2 presents region-level information on the first two years of reform agenda implementation (1988-89 and 1989-90) in terms of the leadership structure adopted by regions to implement their middle grade reform objectives and on their regional accomplishments. The descriptive information presented in this report was obtained through interviews, site visits and observations. Leadership structure is described in terms of leadership provided by individuals and committees. Regional accomplishments are described in three broad categories: (1) staff development, (2) communication, and (3) formation of linkages with representatives from institutions of higher education (IHE), County Offices of Education (COE), and other educational or community agencies.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Selected teachers and administrators within each region comprised a core steering committee. This committee met regularly to strategically plan regional reform activities, to brainstorm solutions to common problems, and to engage in what became referred to as "risk-free" sharing of ideas about middle grade reform.

- The more than 1000 teachers and administrators who participated in staff development activities, were exposed to nationally renowned experts on middle grade reform and experienced local educators. Through regional and statewide conferences, educators were able to communicate with other middle level educators from within and beyond their regions.

- Newsletters and/or directories were published in all regions described successful school programs for middle grade students and provided an effective mechanism for directing school visitations.

- Several hundred teachers and administrators visited schools in their regions, therefore having a first-hand opportunity to observe successful reform programs being implemented.

- University faculty, particularly state university faculty, became integrally involved in the middle grade reform activities of a number of regions. This involvement is increasing and has contributed to serious reconsideration of training programs for middle level educators in several state universities.

- Other (nonpartnership) schools serving the middle grades have been drawn into the enthusiastic net of reform. In one region, 80 additional schools have received the regional newsletter and attended regional conferences.

- In some regions excitement about middle grade reform has prompted discussions about how to continue with regional affiliations after the project has concluded.

The major findings show that middle grade reform is being embraced at the regional level. A desciption of the components which contributed to these findings above is provided below.

How did the leadership provided by Foundation School staff vary from region to region?

The type of leadership provided by Foundation School staff varied according to the school's historical involvement in middle grade reform and the leadership style of the principal. More effective leadership was provided by staff of Foundation Schools which had already established their own middle grade reforms and therefore were able to share their successful experiences with the partners in the region.

Foundation School principals all reported similar roles and responsibilities, but differed in the ways they carried out their responsibilities. For example, some principals kept a close rein on regional activities while others involved large numbers of individuals by delegating tasks out. Educators in regions with Foundation School principals who delegated tasks among partners in the regions evidenced higher degrees of collegiality and camaraderie.

How did leadership provided by individuals (other than the Foundation School principal) vary from region to region?

All regions had one primary individual assisting the Foundation School principal who served a major role in coordinating regional activities. In addition, the number of other identifiable individual leaders ranged from two to eleven per region. These leaders included Partnership School principals, teachers, and individuals from COEs or IHEs who were responsible for a specific task such as producing a newsletter or coordinating a conference. The roles and responsibilities of individual leaders varied considerably from region to region. In general, however, the greater the diffusion of regional responsibilities among numerous individuals in the region, the more likely the region was to have accomplished more in terms of providing staff development, publishing newsletters and directories, and moving toward achieving regional goals.

How did regions differ with respect to the leadership provided by committees?

A core steering committee which met on a regular basis and consisted of Network principals was found in all but one region. This committee guided regional activities and provided an opportunity for principals to develop close, supportive relationships with one another. Most regions held their meetings on a regular basis at different school sites. These committee meetings were most efficient when the business meetings were extended to include staff development for teachers. In this way both business and staff development functions occurred concurrently. In addition to the core steering committee, each region had from two to six additional committees. Some of these committees were short-term and specific to a particular activity or event (e.g., a conference). Other committees were ongoing and related to regional objectives. These objective-

specific committees were highly effective and contributed greatly toward accomplishments related to regional goals.

What factors minimized the disruptive effect of staff turnover at the Foundation School ?

From year one to year two, staff turnover among principals occurred in four Foundation Schools and, in some regions, up to half of the principals of the Partnership Schools. The disruption caused by staff turnover at the Foundation School was minimized in regions where: (1) the Foundation School principal had involved Partnership School principals in coordinating regional activities prior to leaving; (2) Partnership principals elected their own leader to replace the departing Foundation School principal; (3) the new Foundation School principal had been highly involved in regional activities prior to being assigned to the position of Foundation School principal; and (4) Partnership principals had assumed a high degree of responsibility for regional functioning.

What did regions accomplish in terms of staff development?

Staff development was a major focus for all regions. Nearly all regions hosted an annual conference each year (up to 500 attendees) which featured nationally known keynote speakers and breakout sessions presented primarily by Network teachers, although presentations were also made by IHE faculty, COE consultants and community resource persons. These conferences enabled schools to share their effective programs and practices. Other sources of staff development included open enrollment for all schools in a region to attend each other's inservices; however, most teachers did not take advantage of this

opportunity because opportunities were not publicized. Some regions hired professional trainers to provide regional inservices. Another avenue was to provide staff development in conjunction with regularly scheduled regional business meetings. This format was effective and nearly all regions have now adopted this approach.

What did regions accomplish in terms of improving the channels of communication among their Partnership Schools regarding middle grade reform?

Newsletters, directories, and telecommunication networks were the major avenues of communication about middle grade reform. In the first year, nearly all regions published newsletters which spotlighted successful programs in the region's schools and provided the name and phone number of a contact person. These newsletters were very informative and professional in appearance. Further, they were often distributed to all schools with middle grade students in a region. The publication of newsletters waned in year two as regions moved toward the more permanent desk-top reference on successful programs through the publication of directories. The purpose of a directory was to provide a full description of successful reform programs in a region along with a reference for additional information. The directory could then be used to guide visitations to schools with programs of interest. Telecommunications systems were established and functional in only a few regions by the end of year two.

What types of linkages were established between schools, and between schools and IHEs, COEs, and other community resources?

The major accomplishment in year one was establishing linkages among partners within each region through regional meetings and among Foundation School

principals through statewide meetings. In year two, a number of successful linkages were established with IHEs leading to substantial policy changes at several universities; student teachers were placed only in Partnership Schools in one region and several state university campuses are currently setting up or considering setting up programs with specializations in middle level education. Thus, the IHE link has been and is expected to continue to be productive. Linkages with COEs occurred in only a few regions. There were few examples of successful linkages with social or community agencies because regions and schools had not yet begun to work on establishing such linkages.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Nearly all regions embraced the concepts from CIM (as shown in Technical Report 1) and were able to begin to implement those concepts through strong and effective regional processes. The following recommendations are offered in the spirit of fine tuning an already well-orchestrated symphony.

- **Select sites to coordinate regional activities based on the progress the schools have historically made in the area of middle grade reform.**
- **Encourage Foundation School principals to adopt a "team" approach to leadership and to delegate responsibilities to other educators in the regions.**
- **Encourage regions to actively involve teachers and other non-administrative personnel in leadership positions.**
- **Encourage regions to continue with existing committees or to create committees to facilitate the implementation of regional objectives.**
- **Encourage regions to continue with or adopt a meeting format that includes a staff development component and visitations for teachers.**
- **Encourage regions to continue to offer an annual regional conference.**

- Encourage regions to plan and implement long-term intensive staff development.

- Encourage regions to continue to disseminate information about successful school programs through newsletters and directories.

- Encourage Foundation School principals who have established linkages with IHEs and COEs to share their success stories and to encourage Partnership Schools in their region to establish like contracts.

INTRODUCTION

In 1988, California began to implement its agenda for reform in the middle grades by designating ten regional networks, each composed of one Foundation School and ten to thirteen Partnership Schools. All schools in each regional network were considered partners dedicated to achieving state-of-the-art education in middle grades. Each Partnership School was given the charge of implementing site-specific reform efforts for their middle grade students. Each Foundation School, selected for its potential to model excellence and to facilitate the reform efforts of the Partnership Schools in its region, was to provide assistance to schools in its region.

The implementation of the California agenda for middle grade reform has been the focus of an intensive evaluation since its inception. Two technical reports were prepared as part of the interim evaluation. Technical Report 1 provided school-level information on the first-year implementation of the agenda with respect to Partnership School plans to carry out reform recommendations. Technical Report 2 presents region-level information on the first two years' implementation in terms of the leadership structure adopted by regions to implement their middle grade reform objectives and on the resultant regional accomplishments. Leadership structure is discussed in terms of leadership provided by individuals and committees. Regional accomplishments are discussed in three broad categories: (1) staff development, (2) communication, and (3) formation of linkages with representatives from institutions of higher education (IHEs), County Offices of Education (COE), and other educational or community agencies.

This report begins with an overview of the California agenda for reform and presents the statewide findings with respect to the processes regions

undertook as they pursued their goals of middle grade reform. The information presented in this report is intended to be descriptive. Fairly detailed narrative descriptions are provided in the appendices of the activities occurring in each region; however, this report is not and was not intended to be a case study.

Following the statewide overview, a description of the processes and activities occurring in each of the ten regions is presented in ten separate appendices. The intent of the report is to provide formative feedback to consultants in the Office of Middle Grades Support Services in the California Department of Education, and to Foundation School staff, to assist them as they attempt to improve the processes of their ten regions. The focus of the report is, therefore, on components of regional processes and on the factors which contributed to successful and less successful activities. There is no attempt to translate regional processes into effects at the classroom level. The final report will address questions about the effectiveness of the California agenda for reform.

Data for this report were collected throughout year one and year two of the project. A description of the design and data collection methods for the study is located in Technical Report 1. The primary data collection methods for Technical Report 2 were site visits and interviews with Foundation School principals and assistants.

BACKGROUND ON THE CALIFORNIA AGENDA FOR REFORM IN MIDDLE GRADE EDUCATION

The California agenda for reform in middle grades was proposed in the 1987 report of the California Middle Grade Task Force. This report, entitled *Caught*

in the Middle: Educational Reform for Young Adolescents in California Public Schools (CIM), represents the efforts of 36 task force members and eight other persons throughout the state who served on six regional advisory panels. The report contains 102 recommendations for improving middle grade education and proposes an agenda that is predicated on the premise that optimal reform will result from collaboration and "partnerships" among schools, each learning from and helping one another. Further, the agenda strongly supports the notion of local control; that is, schools within a partnership are in the best position to diagnose their own weaknesses and to propose needed reform strategies.

Regional Networks

In 1988, California began implementing the agenda by designating ten regional networks, each comprised of one Foundation School and approximately ten partners dedicated to achieving state-of-the-art education in middle grades. Each Partnership School was given the charge of implementing site-specific reforms for their students in the middle grades. Each Foundation School, selected for its potential to model excellence and to facilitate the reform efforts of Partnership Schools in its regional network, was to provide assistance to schools in its region. For the 1988-89 school year, each Network received $35,500 from private foundations (the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan) to implement its regional activities. For the 1989-90 school year, each Network received $41,600 from private foundations. Additional funding was also provided by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation of New York. Regional networks became functional during the 1988-89 school year and will continue to function through the 1990-91 school year.

Partnership Schools

Each Partnership School was charged with the responsibility of establishing reform objectives from among the findings and recommendations contained in CIM. While reform objectives varied from school to school, there were shared fundamental commitments among the Partnership Schools to:

- Plan and implement new and innovative strategies, programs practices, and policies which had the potential to facilitate the achievement of middle grade education reform;
- Engage in research-oriented activities related to instructional issues and to evaluate systematically and report findings through varied forums;
- Make a multiple year commitment in order to allow the critical steps of planning, implementing, and evaluating (both formative and summative) to occur in relation to new programs and practices;
- Create linkages among people, institutions, and organizations that allowed a continuous exchange of formal and informal ideas and concepts; to share resources; and to seek to change and improve middle grade education in substantive ways;
- Serve as a catalyst for middle grade education renewal and reform; to use the networking capabilities of the partnership to disseminate findings and recommendations widely to all levels of public education.

Foundation Schools

A Foundation School was selected for each of the ten regional networks. A description of the process by which Foundation Schools were selected is provided in Technical Report 1. The basic mission of a Foundation School was to help Partnership Schools within its region achieve their reform objectives. In order to do this, Foundation Schools had to demonstrate strong leadership in all areas

of reform associated with early adolescent education. Evidence of this leadership was expressed through:

- Modeled excellence in specific areas of middle grade education reform identified in the findings and recommendations of the California Middle Grade Task Force;
- Logistical support which facilitated collegial and collaborative efforts among professionals and support personnel as they explored, created, planned, implemented, and evaluated new middle grade education programs and practices;
- Creation of linkages with institutions of higher education, health support services, and social service agencies which influence the lives of young adolescents;
- Professional vision which enabled exploration, innovation and a "cutting edge" approach to the goals associated with state-of-the-art middle grade education.

External funding for each region was routed through the Foundation School. This funding was made available through private foundations which included the Carnegie Corporation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. These resources were to be used to facilitate the reform efforts of Partnership Schools.

Administration

The regional networks of Foundation and Partnership Schools are administered by the California Department of Education (CDE), through the specially created Office of Middle Grades Support Services. This Office is assisted by multiple units within the CDE, such as the Instructional Support Services Division, the Office of School Improvement, the Special Studies and Evaluation Reports Unit, and the Office of Special Programs.

Designation of Regional Boundaries

Ten Foundation Schools and 105 Partnership Schools were united into ten regions representing the entire state of California. Regional boundaries were based on logical clusterings of schools and on district and county lines. In urban areas, which housed a number of adjacent schools, designated regions occupied a relatively small area. In rural areas, where great distances separated schools, designated regions occupied a large area. Physical characteristics (such as mountain ranges) were taken into account when determining regional boundaries in order to facilitate collaboration among schools. Each region was given a letter identifier from A to J. The number of schools per region ranged from ten to 13.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES, LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

It is impossible to describe an "average" region. Regions differ with respect to their physical characteristics (e.g., location in the state, size, population density), school characteristics (e.g., grade levels, enrollment, district affiliation and size), and student characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, percent of students from families receiving "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (AFDC), and scores on California Achievement Program (CAP) tests). A detailed description of the demographic differences among regions can be found in Technical Report 1. The intent of this report is to describe reform implementation similarities and differences among regions with respect to their objectives, their leadership structures, and their accomplishments during the first two years of the project.

REFORM OBJECTIVES

Each region identified a set of objectives in the master plan for the three year project. These objectives were identified based on a consensus view of reform needs of the schools in the region. Not surprisingly, regions differed with respect to their objectives. Fourteen different objectives were listed in ten regional master plans. The three most frequently listed objectives were: 1) improving strategies for active/cooperative learning (N=6); 2) developing programs for at-risk students (N=6); and 3) improving advisory programs (N=6). In decreasing order of frequency, other objectives listed were: improving staff development (N=4), increasing equal access of all students to higher level courses (N=4), implementing an interdisciplinary curriculum (N=3), developing

a communications network (N=2), developing linkages (N=2), establishing a clearinghouse of regional information (N=1), increasing parent involvement (N=1), implementing a master schedule that facilitates equal access to higher level courses (N=1), and developing a positive school culture (N=1).

Although some regions listed objectives related to network building and facilitating communication among Partnership Schools, most objectives specifically related to recommendations in CIM. Accomplishment of these objectives was the impetus for adoption of specific leadership structures.

THE BIG PICTURE

The purpose of this report is to provide detailed feedback to CDE and Foundation School staffs to help them improve the processes regions adopt in their pursuit of middle grade reform. Consequently, the report attends to components of reform efforts, an attention that can distract the reader from the big picture view of middle grade reform in California. To properly set the stage for the report, a big picture overview is essential. To summarize, during the past two years:

- Selected teachers and administrators within each region comprised a core steering committee. The committee met regularly to strategically plan reform regional activities, to brainstorm solutions to common problems, and to engage in what became referred to as "risk-free" sharing of ideas about middle grade reform.

- The more than 1000 teachers and administrators who participated in staff development activities were exposed to nationally renowned experts on middle grade reform and experienced local educators. Through regional and statewide conferences, educators were able to communicate with other middle level educators from within and beyond their regions.

- Newsletters and/or directories were published in all regions described successful programs for middle grade students and provided an effective mechanism for directing school visitations.

- Several hundred teachers and administrators visited schools in their regions, therefore having a first-hand opportunity to observe successful reform programs being implemented.

- University faculty, particularly state university faculty, became integrally involved in the middle grade reform activities of a number of regions. This involvement is increasing and has contributed to serious reconsideration of training programs for middle level educators in several state universities.

- Other (nonpartnership) schools serving the middle grades have been drawn into the enthusiastic net of reform. In one region, 80 additional schools have received the regional newsletter and attended regional conferences.

- In some regions excitement about middle grade reform has prompted discussions about how to continue with regional affiliations after the project has concluded.

The major findings show that middle grade reform is being embraced at the regional level. A desciption of the components which contributed to these findings is provided below.

LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES

Statewide Leadership

The intent of this report is to focus on regional level activities. It is important to note, however, that statewide leadership was provided through regular meetings of the ten Foundation School principals. Held every quarter at alternate Foundation Schools, these meetings provided an opportunity for Foundation School principals to develop strong relationships with one another and to share solutions to common problems. Over the course of the first two years the benefit of these meetings has become very clear. Foundation School principals routinely used them as a forum to obtain information and recommendations to assist their Partnership Schools in their reform efforts and to further their own programs. Also conducted at these meetings were discussions on issues related to administering the statewide program and future directions for the California agenda for reform. The value of these meetings and the strong

statewide leadership which resulted are integrally related to the successes achieved thus far in the regions.

Foundation School Leadership

Coordination of regional activities was the responsibility of the Foundation School. The type of leadership provided by the Foundation School staff depended upon historical involvement in middle grade reform and the leadership style of the principal.

Foundation Schools were as unique as were their regions. Some were in urban locations, others in rural locations; some had high concentrations of minority students; others had very few minority students. It was clear that some Foundation Schools had more resources to devote toward fulfilling their Foundation School responsibilities than others.

Foundation Schools differed in the degree to which their staff had implemented middle grade reforms prior to becoming a Foundation School, although most had well established exemplary middle grade programs. For example, several had implemented school-wide interdisciplinary teams. These schools had typically received a large number of visitors to view their programs both before and after becoming a Foundation School. Their staff applied to become Foundation Schools in order to receive recognition for the good work they were already doing. In terms of their ability to provide regional leadership, staff at these Foundation Schools were able to share their successful experiences with other schools in the region as well as to act as overall facilitators of reform in the region.

A few sought to become a Foundation School in order to obtain leverage for implementing middle grade reforms still in the planning stages. Staff at these schools had good intentions but had not yet implemented the middle grade

reforms they desired. Since staff at these schools were "in the trenches" of reform at the same time as the other schools in their region, they were particularly sympathetic to the difficulties of implementing reform. While staff at these schools were able to provide leadership in terms of mutual support, they were not able to serve as a model for the schools in their region. Further, the reform activities in their own schools may have directed their attention away from their Foundation School responsibilities. For these reasons, it appeared that staff at schools with well established reform programs were better able to function as regional leaders than staff at schools just beginning to implement their own reform efforts.

Foundation School principals differed in their leadership styles. Foundation School principals all reported similar responsibilities in their role of facilitator for regional activities. For example, each was responsible for organizing and presiding over regional meetings; communicating with Partnership School principals, the CDE, COEs, IHEs representative and community representatives; managing the regional budget; making presentations to professional groups and the community; and in general providing leadership and vision. It was in carrying out these responsibilities that leadership style differences emerged. Some of the principals were most comfortable delegating regional responsibilities while others felt more comfortable occupying a central position in the coordination of regional activities. The style of the Foundation School principal was evidenced in the number of individual leaders and committees identified in the region. Delegating principals were associated with regions with a higher number of individual leaders as well as committees. Educators in these regions reported higher levels of collegiality and camaraderie.

Individual Leaders

The number of individual leaders identified in each region ranged from two to eleven. In some regions, only a few individuals other than the Foundation School principal were identified as "leaders". In other regions, many individuals (such as principals and teachers) from Partnership Schools and individuals from COEs and IHEs were identified as leaders.

At a minimum, the Foundation School principal or the person in charge of coordinating regional activities (also called the "acting" Foundation School principal) and one primary "project coordinator" or "assistant" carried primary responsibility for orchestrating and implementing regional agendas. Different regions gave different titles to the "project assistant" but the responsibilities of this person were alike. The assistant was responsible for the logistics of the regional activities. This person would schedule, attend, and prepare minutes of regional meetings; maintain mailing lists, and handle correspondence. A colleague in the middle grade reform, the assistant often was also responsible for specific reform activities. For example, in two regions, the assistant spearheaded and implemented a telecommunications system. At a minimum, this team of two could be found in every region.

As mentioned previously, the number of essential individual leaders ranged from two to eleven. The roles and responsibilities of individual leaders varied from region to region. Some individuals produced newsletters, others coordinated conferences, others put together telecommunication systems. The responsibilities of each of these leaders in each region are described in the attached appendices.

Committees

All regions reported a number of committees (also called teams, groups,

task forces, subcommittees) formed to implement the regional objectives. While the number and function of committees varied from region to region, one core committee was found in most regions. This core committee was variously called "the steering committee", the "leadership team", or the "advisory committee". These committees were all remarkably similar in terms of composition and function. Their members were primarily principals from the Partnership Schools and the Foundation School. Regions that had project assistants also included them in the core steering committee meeting. Some regions also included representatives from their COE and IHEs in their core steering committee membership.

The function of these core committees was to plan regional objectives and to facilitate their implementation. The committees served an important purpose in addition to monitoring regional objectives. They established supportive relationships among principals and provided a forum for idea sharing and problem solving. The relationships formed due to membership in the steering committee were frequently mentioned as a major benefit to participating in a network: principals felt encouraged to implement change in their schools when fortified by the support and experiences of their colleagues in the region.

While there was consistency among regions relative to the composition and function of the core steering committee, there were noteworthy differences regarding the meeting format. Some regions met on a monthly basis and used the meetings exclusively for regional planning. Others extended the regional meeting format to include a staff development component in the form of teacher exchanges, visitations, or training.

In addition to the core steering committee, each region had from two to six additional committees. Some of these committees were short-term and

specific to a particular activity or event (e.g., a conference). When the event or activity had passed, the committee disbanded. Other committees were ongoing and related to particular regional objectives. For example, an "active-learning" committee spearheaded a variety of staff-development activities designed to increase the active learning skills of teachers in one region. The composition and function of these committees is described separately for each region. These objective-specific committees were highly effective and contributed greatly toward the accomplishments of the regions.

The Effect of Staff Turnover

A high rate of staff turnover both at Foundation and Partnership Schools was found.[1] No region was immune from the effect of staff turnover from year one to year two. At the end of year one, four regions lost their Foundation School principals. In addition, all but one region lost from one to six Partnership School principals. The impact of this turnover varied from region to region. In most cases, a change in Partnership School principals did not significantly disrupt regional functioning. Changes in Foundation School leadership, however, had noticeable impact on several of the regions.

The degree to which a turnover in Foundation School leadership negatively affected regional functioning depended upon the situation in each region prior to the loss. In one region, the new principal had to adjust to a new community, a new school, a new role of Foundation School principal, and to all of the Partnership Schools in the region. This principal had to assume the leadership

[1] In the vast majority of cases, principals were transferred to other schools within their district. In only a few cases did principals choose to change jobs.

direction established by the prior principal, whether this approach was natural to her or not. Further, when she as a "newcomer" tried to carry out the responsibilities of Foundation School principal without an established system for delegation, the experience and expertise of the Partnership principals was not used effectively. Although the assistant coordinator in the region remained the same and therefore provided important continuity, the region suffered in its productivity while the new principal settled in. Another contributing factor in this disruptive transition was that Partnership School principals in this region evidently perceived the Foundation School as the primary source of direction and therefore, did not assume responsibility for regional activities.

In a second region, the vice principal at the Foundation School had carried many of the regional responsibilities during year one and when he moved into the position of Foundation School principal in year two, the transition was an easy and natural one. Partnership principals in this region had previously assumed a high degree of responsibility for regional activities. Consequently, there was virtually no disruption in this region due to the change in principals.

In a third region, a variety of factors contributed to a temporary disruption in regional functioning at the end of year one. In this region, the district was a directive partner in the regional functioning. Turnover in both the Foundation School principal and the district liaison contributed to a need to regroup at the beginning of year two. Sequential rotating regional coordinators were selected to act in place of a Foundation School principal for years two and three. Following an adjustment period, this region adopted new leadership structures to guide their regional activities.

In a fourth region, the highly involved Partnership School principals did not want a new Foundation School principal to step into the role of coordinating

regional activities in year two before acquiring a history and understanding of the region. In this region, the Partnership School principals did not want to slow down their progress while a new Foundation School principal became oriented. Consequently, the responsibilities of "Foundation School principal" were delegated to a Partnership School principal by consensus vote of all partners in this region. This was a spontaneous (and somewhat renegade) solution to the transition problem, but it actually worked very well. A program coordinator in the Foundation School served as a representative to the Network. When a new principal was eventually appointed at the Foundation School (who actually was a principal from a Partnership School in that region!), it was agreed that he would not assume Foundation School principal responsibilities until the 1990-91 school year, but even then he would have to be elected by the group of principals.

The experiences of these regions show the degree to which a turnover in the Foundation School may or may not be disruptive to regional functioning. Diffusion of responsibility is one way to avoid negative consequences. If other staff at the Foundation School and in the region share responsibility for regional activities, then the loss of the Foundation School principal is not as disruptive. Moreover, if Partnership principals view themselves as essential leaders in the region, they are more likely to step in and take charge in the event of a turnover at the Foundation School. In fact, the diffusion of responsibility in one region was reported as a significant accomplishment for the first year of the project, as evidenced by the comment:

> At monthly partnership meetings the principal of the school where the meeting is to be held is responsible for the meeting agenda, minutes and the teacher inservice. The shared responsibility has made the region stronger and more effective.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The major accomplishment in year one in all regions was the successful establishment of functional regional networks. These Networks enabled principals to obtain support for their reform efforts and to see successful programs in other schools. Written comments on surveys regarding regional accomplishments in year one included:

> After 30 years in education . . . I can tell you that I have never felt the rapport and peer relationship that I now feel with my colleagues from the region . . . Under the Foundation School principal's leadership, I feel that we are all equal partners and that has been rewarding.

> Without a doubt, the <u>most</u> valuable aspect of the Partnership has been the opportunity of the various staffs to meet and observe one another.

Other accomplishments were closely related to the regional objectives. These accomplishments are described below.

<u>Staff Development</u>

All regions provided opportunities for staff development in the form of regional meetings or conferences.[2] The majority of regions opted to sponsor an annual large-scale regional conference with up to 500 educators attending the event. In a few regions, these one-day conferences were co-sponsored by IHEs, COEs, and local school districts. Conference attendance was usually supported

---

[2] Staff development was provided by the CDE in the form of an annual conference each summer. All principals and two to four teachers from each of the 115 participating schools would attend the three day event. The first summer a planning conference, sponsored and subsidized by the CDE, was held in San Diego. The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation provided funding for the second summer conference. The theme of this conference was "Equal Access", providing opportunity for all students to have equal access to all levels of curriculum. The Foundation also provided additional funding to each region for follow-up conferences during the 1989-90 school year.

entirely out of foundation funds for region participants; non-network attendees were usually charged a registration fee. In a few regions, however, a registration fee was required for all attendees.

These conferences were highly impressive. Conference schedules were professionally printed and first-class in appearance. Many conferences were held in schools, although some were in hotels, conference centers, or on a university campus. It was not the location of the conferences, however, that left the attendee with a lasting impression. It was the quality of the content of the breakout sessions and keynote presentations.

All conferences featured one or more nationally recognized keynote speakers including Joel Milgram (University of Cincinnati), Jaime Escalante (teacher featured in the movie, Stand and Deliver), Dr. Bettie Youngs (nationally known speaker on adolescence), Gene Bedley (nationally known speaker on self-esteem), Nancy Doda (educational consultant and middle school specialist from Virginia), Neila Connors (Valdosta University in Georgia), George McKenna (superintendent of California Inglewood School District) Henry Gradillas (former principal of Garfield High in Los Angeles) and Miles Myers (co-founder of the California Writing Project and president of the National Council of Teachers of English). These speakers provided useful information as well as inspiration.

Even more impressive, however, were the "breakout" sessions. There were always a wide variety to choose from - often up to 18. And these sessions were most often prepared and presented by teachers from Partnership Schools in the region. Some breakouts were also presented by COE, IHE and community resource persons. There were many benefits to this format. One was the opportunity for schools to share their effective programs and practices with other schools and to gather information to improve their own programs. The conference provided

a natural forum for such exchange. Equally exciting was the opportunity for teachers to conceptually organize the information pertaining to their programs in order to provide a cohesive presentation and to hone their presentation skills. They were given the opportunity to learn to be a teacher-trainer, an opportunity not often provided to many teachers.

Regions nearly always provided opportunities for staff development in addition to the annual conference. In one region, a Teacher Center served four of the districts whose schools were participants in the regional network. As a result, the coordinator of the Teacher Center became a very active partner in the network, conducting a staff development needs assessment in the partnership schools and arranging staff development offerings through the Teacher Center for the region.

In many regions, school inservices were open to educators in all other Partnership Schools in the region. The success of open enrollment at school inservices, however, depended upon a variety of factors such as travel time among schools, the notification provided to teachers about inservice opportunities, and the ease with which teachers could get permission and funding to attend the inservices. Unfortunately, there is not much evidence that open enrollment at inservices was an effective means of providing staff development. One interesting variation on the open enrollment at inservices that takes advantage of available technology was adopted by several schools. Inservices were videotaped and these tapes were either housed in a lending library or systematically routed through all Partnership Schools on a monthly basis. Again, the degree to which these videotapes were utilized is unknown at this time.

One efficient mechanism for providing regular staff development opportunities was to provide a teacher inservice in conjunction with the regular

meeting of the region's "leadership team". Seven regions adopted this highly successful format. Teachers would accompany their principals to the regional meeting. The host school was responsible for organizing a school tour which would spotlight their strongest programs. Teachers were then given the opportunity to observe classroom activities, to meet with other teachers, and sometimes, to participate in a related inservice. In addition to having an opportunity to see other schools in action, teachers were exposed to and often involved in the coordination of regional activities along with their principals. By the end of the year two, most regions had adopted this approach.

As another example of staff development in one region, extensive and ongoing staff development was provided for a cadre of teachers from each partnership school for one year. Fourteen all-day inservices on three identified priorities were provided by three outside consultants. The network paid the consultant fees and schools picked up the substitute salaries. The intent was to train the cadre of teachers as trainers for other staff members in the network. This proved to be most effective in bringing about actual change at the school site.

Communication

Establishing channels of communication among schools in a region was a particular focus in year one of the project. Most regions provided an opportunity for principals to visit and communicate with other schools in the region by scheduling their regional advisory meetings at rotating schools. A school tour which highlighted the strongest programs was nearly always incorporated into the meeting agenda. Initially, this opportunity to view other schools was extended to teachers in only a few regions. By the end of year two, however, most regions had begun including a teacher visitation component to their regional meetings.

Newsletters were one mode of communication adopted by most regions. The purpose and format of the newsletters was similar - to describe successful programs and practices in schools across the region. Production of newsletters involved all regional participants. Partnership Schools would write descriptions of their programs and provide the name and address of a contact person. Newsletters also provided an opportunity to reprint research briefs and to pass along regional information. Most regions published one or more newsletters in the first year. Interestingly, enthusiasm for the newsletter waned in the second year. Presumably, descriptions of the innovative programs had already been published and the need for such a forum diminished. Another factor that evidently contributed to the decline in the number of newsletters was the difficulty in getting schools to meet submission deadlines. As a result, fewer newsletters were published in the second year of the project.

Concurrent with the decrease in the publication of newsletters was the onset of the development of regional directories. The purpose of a directory was to systematically identify and describe exemplary programs within a region. Schools within the region (or those visiting from outside the region) could refer to the directory when looking for ideas about improving certain components of their educational program. The interested schools could contact the responsible person at the host school and arrange for a visit.

Several different types of directories were developed. In one type, all schools responded to a survey on the 22 key recommendations in CIM. The directory then identified the schools strong in each of the 22 areas. In another type, the directory was organized around a theme (e.g., interdisciplinary teaming or integrated core curriculum) and contained descriptions of innovative programs related to the theme. These directories were reportedly very useful for

organizing visitations and obtaining information from schools with successful programs.

In three regions, setting up a telecommunications network was a high priority. A telecommunications network was viewed as especially critical in regions where geographical distances prevented convenient travel among schools. The amount of energy required to set up such a network was tremendous; it required taking an inventory of available hardware, selecting software, training participants in the selection and hook-up of appropriate hardware, and monitoring the network. Despite the intensive efforts that went into the establishment of a telecommunications network, only two regions had fully functional networks in year two.

Linkages

The linkages established during the first year of the project were primarily established among Partnership Schools in the region. Referring to the foremost accomplishment of the first year, one principal said: "The collegiality among the principals and staff of each school in the region has made partnership activities a positive, meaningful experience for all!" Further, as shown in the survey results presented in Technical Report 1, few linkages outside of those with other Partnership Schools were established during the first year of the project.

By the end of the second year, many regions had successfully established productive relationships with faculty in IHEs and/or with their COE. In particular, a number of regions had established strong ties with an IHE. These linkages seemed to be the result of personal relationships between the Foundation School principal and an IHE faculty member. Once a collaborative relationship was established, the link was forged and IHE involvement was high. Several

regions benefitted on an ongoing basis as a result of the links they forged with an IHE. Others, however, had only sporadic or event-specific involvement with an IHE.

IHE involvement was observed most often in the production of regional conferences and in the placement of student teachers. In several regions, regional conferences were co-sponsored or coordinated with the local IHE. In two regions, a strong link developed because of the placement of student teachers. In fact, one university established a policy to place student teachers only in Partnership Schools. In another region, as a direct result of meetings between a regional committee and IHE representatives, the university is entertaining a formal proposal to develop a specialized program to prepare teachers to work with students in the middle grades. By the end of year two, IHE involvement began to increase due in part to initiation from IHE staff. Evidently the reputation of middle grade reform project sparked interest in the state university community.

The degree to which COEs became involved in regional activities varied considerably. In two regions there was strong COE support, with the middle grade contact person from their respective county offices participating fully in regular monthly meetings, providing staff development, serving on committees, and being a "partner" in every sense of the word. In regions including more than one county within its boundaries, that same sort of support was often visible from at least one of the COEs while others might not have participated at all. Perhaps the greatest COE support occurred in the region where one of the COEs actually contracted with an individual for 35 days per year to give support to the partnership network. The other two counties in that region have also been active participants, contributing in-kind services depending on the

resources of the county offices. They helped in organizing, publicizing, and coordinating the regions' symposia and professional development activities, printing and distributing fliers, newsletters, and directories and, in general, doing whatever they could to support the network activities.

Technical Report 1 showed that few linkages with other community agencies had been established mid-year through year one. This trend had continued in year two, only a few business linkages were reported and virtually no linkages with health agencies were found. CIM had strongly encouraged the formation of such linkages and regions should attend to establishing these important linkages in year three.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Clearly, by the end of year two, nearly all regions had begun to implement selected recommendations from CIM (as shown in Technical Report 1) and were able to support the implementation of those recommendations through strong and effective regional processes.

The following are based on the observation of practices that have been successful in some of the current middle grade networks; their adoption in all regions is recommended. These recommendations are made in the spirit of fine tuning an already well-orchestrated symphony.

1. **Select sites to coordinate regional activities based on the progress the schools have historically made in the area of middle grade reform.**

Effective leadership was related to the historical involvement of the Foundation School staff in middle grade reform. The most effective leadership was provided when staff at the Foundation School were in the process of fine-tuning their existing middle grade reform programs rather than just starting to implement such programs. When not actively involved in the process of radical

change, staff at Foundation Schools were able to devote more resources and attention to the efforts of Partnership Schools in their region. They also had more experience implementing middle grade reforms and could share those experiences.

2. **Encourage Foundation School principals to adopt a "team" approach to leadership and to delegate responsibilities to other educators in the regions.**

The most successful regional networking was found when Partnership School principals and their staff were given and had assumed a high degree of responsibility for the functioning of the region and the accomplishment of its objectives. In these regions, the Foundation School provided logistical support, but most of the regional activities were coordinated and implemented by other educators (both administrators and teachers) in the region. The result was a strong sense of collegiality and the disruption by staff turnover (if it occurred) at the Foundation School was minimized.

3. **Encourage regions to actively involve teachers and other non-administrative personnel in leadership positions.**

Regions which had achieved the most in the two-year period had involved a large number of people, including teachers, in their reform efforts. Usually, a number of individuals (principals, teachers, IHE faculty, CDE consultants and community resource persons) were reported to hold "leadership positions" and these individuals were accountable for specific tasks, such as publishing the newsletter. Including teaching staff in leadership positions may also help bring middle grade reforms to the classroom level.

4. **Encourage regions to continue with existing committees or to create committees to facilitate the implementation of regional objectives.**

Multiple committees which addressed specific regional objectives, met on a regular basis, and were responsible for the achievement of the objectives, contributed to a higher degree of achievement of those objectives. The members of these committees again were teachers and representatives from COEs and IHEs in addition to principals.

5. **Encourage regions to continue with or adopt a meeting format that includes a staff development component and visitations for teachers.**

All but one region held regularly scheduled meetings of their core steering committees. These meetings provided a forum for sharing information related to the statewide project, provided an opportunity for the sharing of ideas and for problem solving, and enabled the committee to monitor regional activities.

There were a number of different formats of these regularly scheduled regional meetings. In some regions, only the Foundation School leaders and principals from Partnership Schools attended. The most efficient format combined the regional meeting of principals (and other involved educators) with an opportunity for teachers to visit the host school and to participate in an inservice. The meeting would be held at rotating schools and several teacher representatives from each Partnership School would be invited to attend. While principals and other committee members met, teachers would tour the school, observe strong programs, perhaps participate in an inservice, and network with other teachers in the region. Providing this opportunity for educators to network directly is completely consistent with the goal of the state reform agenda. This format was an effective means of involving teachers in the reform activities and providing regular staff development and networking opportunities for teachers.

6. **Encourage regions to continue to offer an annual regional conference.**

Most regions held an annual conference in years one and two and plan on a similar conference in year three. (In year two partial funding for a regional conference was provided by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation of New York.) Annual conferences provided an excellent opportunity for networking and for providing staff development to large numbers of educators both in Partnership and non-partnership schools in each region. These conferences were well organized, utilized the expertise of notable educators as keynote speakers, and developed the expertise of local educators who organized and presented the breakout sessions. They provided staff development in areas related to middle grade reform for large numbers of educators as well as providing an opportunity for educators to network. The regions are doing an exemplary job in this area.

7. **Encourage regions to plan and implement long-term intensive staff development.**

Smaller-scale follow-up staff development opportunities in the regions can augment and reinforce what participants learned in the annual regional conference. This continuity in training is encouraged.

8. **Encourage regions to continue to disseminate information about successful school programs through newsletters and directories.**

Information about school programs and practices was disseminated via regional newsletters and directories. It is important to make schools aware of the strengths of other schools in their region so they can learn from one another. Newsletters routinely carried descriptions of exemplary programs and provided contact names and phone numbers. They also provided information about middle grade events in the region and the state. Nearly all newsletters were very professional in appearance and undoubtedly required considerable effort to publish. A newsletter need not be particularly "slick". One region simply

mailed out the minutes of its regional meetings in lieu of a newsletter. A modified version of this approach might be an efficient means of communication within a region.

Also very polished in appearance, directories provided a more permanent record of program strengths which could serve as a reference throughout the year. The efforts expended to produce this directory should be extensive since the directory would serve as a desk-top reference and for public relations each year.

9. **Encourage Foundation School principals who have established linkages with IHEs and COEs to share their success stories and to encourage Partnership Schools in their region to establish like contacts.**

Those Foundation Schools that have forged strong links with IHEs and COEs have benefitted in many ways from the relationships. But too few linkages have been established by Partnership Schools and by most Foundation Schools at this point in time, and such linkages should be encouraged.

Further, while some regions, primarily through the Foundation Schools, have established strong linkages with representatives from IHEs and COEs, there is little evidence that linkages are being established with other community agencies. Continued efforts to establish such linkages are encouraged.

APPENDICES

NOTE

The following appendices profile the strengths and weaknesses of each region. Each appendix begins with a description of background factors such as student demographics and school characteristics. Many of these factors were extracted from the School Profile Database, a database developed to profile participants at the onset of the project. (This database is described in detail in Technical Report 1.) Thus, these background data pertain to the 1987-1988 school year, the year before the regional networks became functional. The remaining sections of each appendix describe regional processes and accomplishments occuring during the first two years of the project. Each appendix concludes with specific recommendations for improving regional processes during the third year of the project.

Each appendix begins with a description of background factors such as student demographics and school characteristics. Many of these factors were extracted from the School Profile Database, a database developed to profile participants at the onset of the project. (This database is described in detail in Technical Report 1.) Thus, these background data pertain to the 1987-1988 school year, the year before the regional networks became functional. The remaining sections of each appendix describe regional processes and accomplishments occuring during the first two years of the project. Each appendix concludes with specific recommendations for improving regional processes during the third year of the project.

Nearly all regions have been so successful that the majority of recommendations provided for each region merely encourage the continuation of their current activities. There is good reason to believe that regions will have accomplished much by the end of the three-year period, and these accomplishments will be presented in the final report.

Appendix A

Region A: North Central

Background

Region A extends from Sacramento north through the central valley to the Oregon border. It is the second largest region, extending over 21 counties and covering 37,591 square miles. The region can generally be thought of as a campers paradise; it includes 12 major national forests, the majority of the snow skiing areas in the state and lakes Oroville, Tahoe, and Shasta.

The 11 Network schools in the region are located in seven counties and administered by eight different school districts. Five schools are located in the Sacramento area and four of those are in the same school district. The remaining schools are located in varying degrees of isolation (between a two and seven hour drive to the Foundation School). Two schools are highly isolated due to road conditions as well as driving distance. Hayfork Elementary School is in the heart of the Trinity Wilderness area and is accessible by one winding mountain road only. Macdoel Elementary School is located near the Oregon border, close to Mt. Shasta. These two schools are often inaccessible in winter due to snow.

In general, Region A schools are smaller than most schools in the state. Only one region in the state has a lower average enrollment per school. In fact, the rural schools in Region A are very small, with each small school serving only 36 to 124 students in the middle grades. Also, the ethnic distribution of students in Region A differs markedly from the statewide ethnic distribution. Compared with statewide averages, Region A has more white students

(82% compared with 50% statewide) and fewer Hispanic (7.5% compared with 30% statewide) students. Further, the percent of students from families receiving AFDC in both the sixth and eighth grades is higher than the state average.

Description of the Foundation School

Central Middle School is located in Oroville, a town of 45,000 (about 75 miles north of Sacramento). Oroville is an agricultural community with lumber as the primary industry, followed by olive growing. Built in 1951, Central enrolls over 600 students. Although lottery monies have been used to carpet or tile all classrooms and to purchase new furniture, the school still awaits funding for other needed physical improvements.

In the past few years, the school has implemented a number of exceptional educational programs. For example, there is an advanced technology program, an exemplary language arts program, a student recognition program, and the staff show consistent initiative in applying for grants to support school reform efforts.

Student ethnicity at Central is characteristic of other schools in the region; most of the students are white. While enrollment at Central has remained relatively stable in the previous five years, in 1989-90 enrollment increased by twenty percent. This unexpected increase in enrollment required the late hiring of additional staff and the rescheduling of 300 students. The percentage of students from families receiving AFDC has also risen to 25% (for eighth grade students) in recent years and over half the students receive free or reduced lunches. Students at Central score below the fiftieth percentile on the CAP test.

The leadership at the Foundation School has been highly mobile. There were changes in principalship at the end of year one and again at the end of year

two. These changes were elective rather than mandated district transfers. Further, during year two, the school had three different vice principals.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Five hours per week

Title:	Project Coordinator
Position:	Foundation School language arts and GATE teacher
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities
Time devoted:	Six hours and 40 minutes per week [Additional 200-400 hours in kind per year]

Title:	Project Assistant-student leadership
Position:	Foundation School language arts teacher
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities and organize student leadership conference
Time devoted:	100 hours total fall semester, 1989

Committees

Title:	Regional Advisory Team (RAT)
Members:	All Partnership principals, Foundation School leaders, IHE representative
Function:	Develop and coordinate regional activities
Meeting Schedule:	Every two months

Title:	Symposium Planning Committee
Members:	Partnership principals
Function:	Plan and coordinate yearly symposia
Meeting Schedule:	As needed

Title:	Student Leadership Conference Planning Committee
Members:	Three teachers total; three students from each school
Function:	Plan and coordinate January 1990 student conference
Meeting Schedule:	Two planning meetings in fall, 1989

Region A was one of four regions which lost its Foundation School principal at the end of year one. The first principal had collaborated with the teachers

on the Foundation School application and regional plan. His involvement and investment, however, evidently ended after the first year of the project. Fortunately, the project coordinator and project assistant at the Foundation School were with the project from its onset and therefore could share its history with the new principal. Further, the new principal was from a Partnership School in another region, so the concept of regional network was familiar to her. The transition to a new Foundation School principal in year two, however, was not entirely smooth.

The progress of the region was stalled in year two as the principal adjusted to her new responsibilities which included attending to an unresolved teachers' contract and a state bankruptcy claim by the local COE. Further, during year two, three individuals served as vice principal. This adjustment period was also prolonged because a system for collaborative leadership in the region was not established until midway through the 1989-90 school year. At this time the new Foundation School principal shifted leadership to a committee-based approach. Had the past or new Foundation School principal delegated responsibility sooner to the Partnership School principals or had those principals asserted their own desire for responsibility, the transition would most likely have been less disruptive. Further, the committee structure was not aligned with the regional goals thereby contributing to the lack of continuity in work toward those goals during the transition. In addition to a personnel change at the Foundation School, four out of 11 Partnership Schools were also assigned new principals in year two of the project.

At the end of year two the Foundation School principal submitted her letter of resignation to her superintendent. The changes in the principal and vice principals at this school have significantly affected the region. Steps to

minimize disruption from assignment of a third principal in three years at the Foundation School are described in the recommendation section.

As mentioned previously, the committee structure in Region A did not focus specifically on regional goals. There were three formal committees formed to facilitate reform in Region A. The Regional Advisory Team was formulated to bring together principals from each Partnership School to assist in the coordination of regional activities. It was composed of the principals from the 11 Partnership Schools and a project coordinator from the Foundation School. In addition, the IHE representative occasionally attended. This team met on alternate months throughout the school year at alternating schools. Meetings lasted approximately three hours. This meeting format was not optimal for this region, however, since it meant some Partnership School principals had to drive up to six hours round trip in order to attend a three hour meeting.

The Regional Advisory Team served an ice-breaking function in year one. The principals became acquainted, the regional plan was developed, structure of the meetings was established, and a regional conference was planned and implemented. In conjunction with the Regional Advisory Team, a Symposium Planning Committee was formed to organize two major symposia.

In year two, a Student Leadership Conference Planning Committee was also established. This committee consisted of the Foundation School project assistant, two Partnership School teachers, and three students from each partnership school. It met several times in conjunction with the Regional Advisory Team to plan the student leadership conference on drug-free schools.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By April 30, 1989, Region A will form a clearinghouse for exemplary programs and resources within our region.

2. By September 1, 1988, Central Middle School will establish a center for Region A program operation.

3. By June 1990, all Region A schools will have implemented a program providing instructional practice emphasizing active learning strategies which are consistent with the goals of the core curriculum and the developmental characteristics of young adolescents. An evaluation that considers teachers changing teaching strategies, visitations to other programs, peer coaching, and attitude surveys of students, parents, teachers and administrators will be conducted in June 1990.

4. Central Middle School will pursue funding opportunities to establish a communications network connecting all partnership schools in Region A+ with modems and interactive video capabilities to facilitate communication between teachers, students, parents, administration, and California State University Chico.

The effect of the geographical spread in Region A is shown in the types of objectives specified by the partners in the region. Only one objective addressed educational reform in teaching strategies: active learning. The other three objectives are directed at increasing communications among the isolated schools. This focus on communication rather than content is reflected in the regional accomplishments during the first two years of the project.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Region A focused its energy on staff development in the form of day-long conferences. In the fall of 1988 they capitalized on a conference presented by the California League of Middle Schools (CLMS) and hosted a get-acquainted dinner for the 180 teachers from Partnership Schools attending the CLMS conference.

In the spring of 1989, a day-long conference entitled "Equal Access to the Core Curriculum" was hosted on the Chico campus of the California State University. The breakout sessions were presented by teachers from Partnership Schools in the region. Keynote presentations were made in the morning by Dr. Bettie Youngs, a nationally known educator and author on adolescent development and self esteem, and by Gene Bedley, a noted inspirational speaker on the topic of self esteem. This conference was attended by about 100 teachers from the region.

The second major conference was held in the fall of 1989 to kick off the second year of the project. Returning as the keynote speaker again was Dr. Bettie Youngs with two presentations "Working with Young People: What Should We Know - What Can We Do?" and "Keepers of the Dream: Who You are Makes a (Big) Difference." Again the breakout sessions were presented by Partnership School teachers. This conference, held at a Partnership School in Sacramento, was attended by about 350 teachers.

A third conference was held in January 1990 at the Chico campus of the California State University. This conference, supported by Drug-Free Schools funds, was planned and attended by students. The 230 students attending the conference listened to keynote speaker Michael Pritchard speak on "The Power of Choice". Pritchard, a comedian, had hosted his own PBS special during the 1988-1989 season also entitled "The Power of Choice." The students also worked in groups to learn various prevention strategies (e.g., conflict management) to implement at their school sites.

Communication Strategies

Three out of four of the regional objectives related to communication among schools in the region. Communication was considered critical since so many of the schools in this region are isolated. A primary mechanism for communication

among schools was the meetings of the Regional Advisory Team. These meetings, which were hosted by Partnership Schools, enabled principals to visit other Partnership Schools in their region and to discuss reform topics with other colleagues.

Newsletters were also published in the first year in order to share descriptions of exemplary programs in Partnership Schools, and to provide contacts for networking. One of the principals at a Partnership School assumed the position of editor and compiled three newsletters during the first year. This newsletter was distributed to all teachers in the region. The publication of one newsletter in year two is expected.

Initially, the concept of teacher visitations to other schools was encouraged within the region. Project schools adopted a regional policy that all staff development inservices were open to staff in all project schools in the region. Unfortunately, however, very few teachers have taken advantage of the opportunity to visit other schools. In a region where communication among teachers at different schools was so strongly emphasized, it is disappointing that more teacher visitations did not occur. Certainly, geographical distance impeded some visitations. (Although one known visitation required a three-hour drive each direction!) Other factors, however, probably contributed to the lack of teacher visitations. First, despite the philosophy regarding program visitations and staff development inservices, there was no systematic publication or schedule to let teachers know in advance about these opportunities. Second, teachers were not invited to attend Regional Advisory Team meetings and therefore did not have the same opportunity to visit other Partnership Schools as afforded their principals.

Telecommunications were viewed as an optimal means of communication given

the vast distances among schools in this region. Consequently a considerable amount of energy was put into establishing a telecommunications network in Region A. Most of the effort was extended by the Foundation School coordinator. Midway through the second year, the network was functional and principals received training in its use. Principals are now starting to use the California State University Network (CSUNET) electronic mail system.

Linkages

The Foundation School in Region A established a positive working relationship with a faculty member in the School of Education at California State University, Chico. This relationship made possible the two conferences held on that university campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although this region experienced a lull in momentum at the outset of year two, the region is now showing evidence of progress. Many of the recommendations provided here are already being implemented. As an example of efforts to improve regional functioning, a professional facilitator was hired to help principals identify objectives for year three. However, the resignation of the Foundation School principal has considerable implication for functioning of the region in year three. The model adopted by the region in year two with a change in principal at the Foundation School (having the new principal assume the key leadership role) was not effective. Therefore, a regional leadership change is suggested. Rather than expecting the new Foundation School principal to adjust to a role as principal as well as provide regional leadership, the participants in the region are strongly encouraged to consider the following alternatives.

1. The CDE staff and Partnership School principals jointly select a new school from among the current Partners to serve as Foundation School for

year three. All Foundation School responsibilities would shift to this new site.

or

2. The existing Foundation School would continue to house the regional budget but leadership would be provided by a Partnership School principal elected to serve as regional coordinator.

Either one of these alternatives would take advantage of the expertise of the current partners and would minimize disruption due to a change in leadership at the Foundation School.

Implementation of the following recommendations and continuation of current regional efforts should contribute to successes for students in this region in year three.

- Identify a regional coordinator from among existing partners using one of the alternatives described above.
- Diffuse responsibility for regional activities and include teachers in regional leadership positions.
- Combine Regional Advisory Team meetings with visitation and staff development opportunities for teachers.
- Schedule Regional Advisory Team meetings at less frequent intervals and for longer periods of time to make the meetings more efficient for partners driving long distances to get to the meetings.
- Consider adopting new objectives that directly affect educational programming (e.g., active learning curriculum projects).
- Adopt committees specifically to implement new regional objectives.

8/7/89

REGION A

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	587	07-08	587	31	BUTTE	2,844	KK-08
BARRETT INTERMEDIATE	526	07-08	526	29	SACRAMENTO	46,707	KK-12
CARNEGIE INTERMEDIATE	1,001	07-08	1,001	47	SACRAMENTO	46,707	KK-12
CHURCHILL INTERMEDIATE	710	07-08	710	34	SACRAMENTO	46,707	KK-12
GOLDEN STATE JUNIOR HIG	895	06-08	895	53	YOLO	4,763	KK-12
GRIZZLY HILL	192	KK-08	72	14	NEVADA	394	KK-08
HAYFORK VALLEY ELEMENTA	419	KK-08	124	21	TRINITY	642	KK-12
MACDOEL ELEMENTARY	109	01-08	36	7	SISKIYOU	406	KK-12
SALK ALTERNATIVE	621	07-08	621	31	SACRAMENTO	46,707	KK-12
SEQUOIA MIDDLE	827	06-08	827	37	SHASTA	3,078	KK-08
SEVEN HILLS INTERMEDIAT	571	05-08	414	31	NEVADA	1,610	KK-08

REGION A

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	85.7	3.9	4.1	6.3	90.3	.	25.0	.	92.5
BARRETT INTERMEDIATE	86.9	1.9	4.0	7.3	92.5	.	10.1	.	94.0
CARNEGIE INTERMEDIATE	87.0	1.6	3.4	8.0	93.3	.	4.0	.	98.8
CHURCHILL INTERMEDIATE	90.6	1.7	2.3	5.5	92.7	.	11.2	.	93.1
GOLDEN STATE JUNIOR HIG	57.1	3.7	29.1	10.2	89.0	22.9	22.9	71.9	86.5
GRIZZLY HILL	94.3	0.5	1.0	4.1	95.0	26.6	26.6	100.0	100.0
HAYFORK VALLEY ELEMENTA	85.7	0.0	1.7	12.7	91.4	23.5	23.5	100.0	100.0
MACDOEL ELEMENTARY	87.2	0.9	11.9	0.0	94.0	12.4	12.4	100.0	100.0
SALK ALTERNATIVE	71.0	11.4	9.3	8.2	0.0	.	22.0	.	95.7
SEQUOIA MIDDLE	83.1	2.4	4.5	10.0	92.5	20.1	20.1	94.2	95.8
SEVEN HILLS INTERMEDIAT	97.2	0.0	1.8	1.1	93.7	6.2	6.2	100.0	100.0

REGION A

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	.	.	.	42	36	37	44	38	53
BARRETT INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	96	96	92	98	96	96
CARNEGIE INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	88	86	78	85	88	90
CHURCHILL INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	85	84	82	88	89	91
GOLDEN STATE JUNIOR HIG	28	25	27	27	20	25	24	29	22
GRIZZLY HILL	41	51	59	88	82	87	79	95	99
HAYFORK VALLEY ELEMENTA	85	66	66	48	34	33	42	42	39
MACDOEL ELEMENTARY	58	28	70	94	89	87	91	83	.
SALK ALTERNATIVE	.	.	.	50	46	35	44	49	49
SEQUOIA MIDDLE	47	59	66	56	59	57	74	82	54
SEVEN HILLS INTERMEDIAT	91	78	75	89	84	82	96	95	96

52

Appendix B

Region B: South Central

Background

Region B is the third largest region in the state in terms of square miles, occupying 26,348 square miles and extending over 11 counties. It includes agricultural regions such as Modesto and Merced as well as metropolitan areas such as Fresno and Bakersfield. This region encompasses the Yosemite National Park, one of the state's most recognized natural wonders. Schools within this region are spread widely with driving time between the two most distant schools being about six hours. In the winter, travel is often impeded by dense tule fog.

The 11 partners in Region B are located in five counties and are administered by nine separate districts. The district enrollments range from 500 to 66,054. The schools range in enrollment from 277 to 1,408, with the average number of students per school being 745. Three of the schools are in the same K-12 district; the remaining schools are associated with eight separate districts. Four rural schools serve students in grades K-8 and 4-8 with each school enrolling from 83 to 370 students in the middle grades. Seven large schools serve students in grades six to eight, seven to eight, and seven to nine with up to 1,314 students in middle grades. The number of teachers per school ranges from 14 to 56.

Students in Region B are fairly representative of students in the state in general. About half the students are white (52%) and a third Hispanic (33%). However, in four schools, 50 percent or more of the students are Hispanic. Three schools also serve significant pockets of Asian students with 16 percent to 27 percent of the students being Asian. The language needs at several of these

schools are pronounced with one school having merely 4.5 percent of the students coming from homes where English was the only spoken language. The number of eighth grade students from families receiving AFDC ranges from 1.5 percent to 67 percent. Students in Region B, for the most part, do not do well on the CAP test. While two schools had scores in the top quartile, students at most schools scored in the two lowest quartiles.

Description of the Foundation School

The Foundation School in Region B is located in the small agricultural town, Woodlake, of 5,000, about 30 miles from the closest freeway. Built in 1924, the school is slowly undergoing renovation. Some buildings on campus have been condemned and thus are closed. Originally a K-8 school, the school currently enrolls students in grades four to eight . The school is expected to only enroll students in grades six to eight in the near future.

The Foundation School is fairly representative of other schools in the region. Its students are characteristic of those in the region with about 73 percent being Hispanic and only 40 percent of the students come from homes where English is the only language spoken. Similarly, students at the Foundation School (as is true for most students in the region) do poorly on the CAP test with scores well below the state average.

Woodlake had implemented several middle grade reforms prior to becoming a Foundation School. Two-period core classes were taught by academic teams consisting of two teachers. Exploratory and elective courses were offered and flexible scheduling was the scheduling practice.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Seven hours per week

Title:	Foundation School schoolboard community liaison
Position:	Foundation School schoolboard community liaison
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities (1989 - 1990)
Time devoted:	One hour per week

Title:	Foundation School secretary
Position:	Foundation School secretary
Responsibilities:	Clerical assistance on regional activities
Time devoted:	One half hour per week

Title:	Foundation School attendance clerk
Position:	Foundation School attendance clerk
Responsibilities:	Clerical assistance as needed
Time devoted:	Fifteen minutes per week

Committees

Title:	Region B Partnership
Members:	Partnership School administrators and selected teachers from each school
Function:	Plan and implement regional objectives
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Symposium Planning Committee
Members:	Three administrators and two teachers
Function:	Plan yearly symposium
Meeting Schedule:	As needed

Title:	At-Risk Subcommittee
Members:	One representative from each school
1988-89 Function:	Planning strategies for students at risk of dropping out; preparing directory of successful programs for at-risk students
1989-90 Function:	Maintaining directory of successful programs for at-risk students
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Core Curriculum Subcommittee
Members:	One representative from each school
1988-89 Function:	Inactive
1989-90 Function:	Evaluating current status of schools with regard to core curriculum and equal access the core curriculum
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Leadership Camp Subcommittee
Members:	Five administrators and teachers
1988-89 Function:	Inactive
1989-90 Function:	Plan student leadership camp for fall, 1990
Meeting Schedule:	As needed

Region B was another region affected by personnel changes at the Foundation School. The transition, however, appeared to have had little negative effect on the functioning of the region. In year one of the project, the Foundation School principal was assisted by the vice principal, and a project assistant. The project assistant was assigned by the district Board of Directors to work on Foundation School activities two hours a day. The services of the assistant were an in-kind contribution from the district. The assistant worked on the regional plan and provided support for the regional activities.

In year two of the project, the vice principal assumed the position of principal. Since the vice principal had been highly involved with the project prior to his promotion, he was able to continue on with the work he had already started. Region B was the only region in the state where there were no changes in Partnership School staff during the first two years of the project.

The Region B meetings are composed of principals in all Partnership Schools. While some regions use this meeting time for regional planning only, others use the time for staff development and subcommittee planning as well. Region B meetings fit this latter description. The meetings are held monthly for approximately three hours at alternating school sites. Principals attend the

meeting and bring two to three teachers to visit the school. The host school spotlights their strongest programs and teachers are given the opportunity to observe exemplary programs throughout the region. Subcommittees meet during the monthly meetings as well.

The leadership in Region B delegates tasks associated with regional objectives to subcommittees. Over the two-year period, subcommittees comprised of teachers and administrators addressed these regional objectives: active learning strategies, core curriculum, at-risk students and student leadership. These subcommittees meet at the same time as the Region B monthly meetings and minutes from each subcommittee meeting are distributed along with minutes from the general meeting. Subcommittees also work on specific tasks such as the developing the newsletter, organizing the symposium, and finding avenues for use of drug and alcohol grant monies.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By 1990-1991, all participating schools will have a program emphasizing active learning strategies which are consistent with the goals of the core curriculum and the developmental characteristics of young adolescents.

2. By June 1991, all participating schools will have an integrated, interdisciplinary core curriculum for all students.

3. By fall 1989, all participating schools will have implemented a program providing an opportunity for successful experiences for all at-risk students.

The objectives set by schools in Region B all address program improvements suggested in CIM: active learning strategies, core curriculum, and programs for at-risk students. The subcommittee structures adopted in this region ensured

that attention was paid to each objective. This attention has paid off, as shown in the next section.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

A region-wide conference was held on a Saturday in February, 1989. Over 300 people attended the one-day session and listened to the keynote speaker Dr. George McKenna's topic "Middle Grades Makes the Difference". McKenna, a nationally know Black educator and principal of the George Washington Preparatory School in South Central Los Angeles, has been interviewed widely on television and was the subject of a CBS television show, "The George McKenna Story." The conference provided over 20 breakout sessions on middle grade themes and subject areas such as cooperative learning strategies, interdisciplinary team teaching, and parent involvement. Speakers were all practitioners from throughout the eleven counties that make up Region B. The sharing of classroom ideas and techniques was the focus of all breakout sessions.

In Region B, staff development was also included as part of the monthly regional meeting. Each month up to 30 teachers per school accompanied their principals to the regional meeting and visited the model programs in that school. In year one, each school was to showcase its model programs related to an interdisciplinary core curriculum. Visiting teachers could carry away concrete ideas for improvement at their own schools. One month, a more formal "mini-conference" was organized to follow the Regional Advisory Committee meeting. The host district arranged for four alternative sessions on: 1) Caught in the Middle-Comprehensive Overview; 2) The at-risk student exploring strategies and classroom techniques; 3) teaming benefits and advantages and how to get started;

and, 4) cooperative learning. Teachers could attend two sessions of their choice.

Staff development opportunities were also extended on a regular basis by an agreement between schools regarding open enrollment for staff inservices. At the beginning of the year, each school published its inservice plan for the year. Teachers did attend staff development sessions at a number of schools.

Communication Strategies

The systematic efforts of Region B schools to communicate with non-partnership in the region have been exemplary. They have systematically identified and publicized innovative programs in Partnership Schools in their region in order to promote visitations. In order to identify innovative programs all schools participated in a needs assessment. The outcome of the needs assessment was a chart profiling school strengths and needs for all major recommendations from the 22 sections of CIM. The chart was designed to easily show which schools had "model programs" and which needed assistance. Schools could then appropriately network based on the outcome of the needs assessment.

In order to share information about programs for at-risk students, each school provided descriptions of programs it offered for publication in a directory. Program descriptions were prepared in a standard form, compiled into a handbook and distributed to all schools with middle grades in the region. Thus, the benefits of the Partnership were extended beyond the participating schools. Finally, a region-wide directory on exemplary core curriculum practices was also developed. These documents are intended to help educators identify schools with programs of interest that they would like to see.

Written information regarding the core curriculum reform was exchanged in the newsletter (only one was published). Also, various practitioners and

research articles were housed in professional libraries at each school. Another avenue used for disseminating information relative to middle grade reform was the local newspaper, where the assistant coordinator regularly publishes articles on education and the principal contributes a regular column in the "Class Notes" section of the paper. Further, each school videotaped its inservices and contributed copies to a video lending library which is housed at one of the Partnership Schools. The degree to which these videotapes were subsequently viewed is unknown.

Linkages

There has been no IHE involvement in Region B as yet. This is, in large part, undoubtedly due to the fact that there are few universities in the region. An effort was made, however, to involve staff at County Offices of Education. At the end of year one, a special breakfast meeting was called to which all COE representatives were invited. The purpose of this meeting was to determine if COE collaboration with the Partnership was possible and, if so, to explore the ways collaboration would be most beneficial. In addition, each COE representative was invited to, and five subsequently attended, the 1989 summer statewide symposium at Stanford University to plan for 1989-1990.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants in Region B have done a good job in identifying substantive goals and mobilizing efforts to achieve those goals. Continuation of their current efforts is the primary recommendation.

- Continue current practice of combining regional meetings with staff development for teachers.

- Increase efforts to establish linkages with IHEs, COEs, and other community agencies.

8/7/89

REGION B

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
WOODLAKE INTERMEDIATE	667	04-08	370	39	TULARE	19,202	KK-12
CLARK INTERMEDIATE	1,408	07-08	1,375	56	FRESNO	4,696	KK-12
HERBERT HOOVER INTERMED	958	06-08	936	45	MERCED	66,054	KK-12
JAMES MONROE JUNIOR HIG	619	07-09	419	33	KERN	6,082	KK-12
KASTNER INTERMEDIATE	1,314	07-08	1,314	56	FRESNO	18,796	KK-12
KINGS RIVER ELEMENTARY	499	KK-08	138	26	TULARE	500	KK-08
LA VINA ELEMENTARY	277	KK-08	83	14	MADERA	13,214	KK-12
SCANDINAVIAN MIDDLE	626	07-08	603	37	FRESNO	62,973	KK-12
SPARKES (FRANK) ELEMENT	531	04-08	298	25	MERCED	1,187	KK-08
TEHIPITE MIDDLE	781	07-08	752	43	FRESNO	62,973	KK-12
TIOGA MIDDLE	525	07-08	500	34	FRESNO	62,973	KK-12

REGION B

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
WOODLAKE INTERMEDIATE	27.4	0.0	72.6	0.0	92.5	19.5	19.5	32.5	40.2
CLARK INTERMEDIATE	73.9	1.7	17.3	7.2	93.7	.	13.2	.	91.9
HERBERT HOOVER INTERMED	39.0	4.8	30.2	26.0	95.5	43.5	43.5	62.3	73.5
JAMES MONROE JUNIOR HIG	87.4	2.7	3.7	6.1	91.6	.	1.5	.	98.1
KASTNER INTERMEDIATE	77.3	1.3	12.9	8.6	93.5	.	8.5	.	92.0
KINGS RIVER ELEMENTARY	33.1	1.2	65.1	0.6	92.9	27.6	27.6	60.0	95.2
LA VINA ELEMENTARY	6.9	0.0	92.4	0.7	0.0	9.6	9.6	4.0	4.5
SCANDINAVIAN MIDDLE	47.9	10.4	25.7	16.0	91.3	.	29.9	.	85.1
SPARKES (FRANK) ELEMENT	53.5	4.1	36.0	6.4	94.7	41.3	41.3	68.8	59.7
TEHIPITE MIDDLE	15.7	7.2	50.3	26.8	89.9	.	67.4	.	52.5
TIOGA MIDDLE	44.2	22.1	26.1	7.7	91.7	.	32.4	.	85.6

62

REGION B

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
WOODLAKE INTERMEDIATE	31	26	22	27	18	14	19	19	45
CLARK INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	71	70	72	62	67	68
HERBERT HOOVER INTERMED	38	31	56	36	40	59	39	30	47
JAMES MONROE JUNIOR HIG	.	.	.	78	79	69	78	81	57
KASTNER INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	92	91	88	93	83	87
KINGS RIVER ELEMENTARY	49	47	18	26	20	23	13	15	32
LA VINA ELEMENTARY	11	23	27	14	20	14	17	13	41
SCANDINAVIAN MIDDLE	.	.	.	20	19	20	31	25	47
SPARKES (FRANK) ELEMENT	29	53	55	17	11	12	17	13	6
TEHIPITE MIDDLE	.	.	.	12	8	16	10	9	5
TIOGA MIDDLE	.	.	.	31	29	29	36	25	34

Appendix C

Region C: **Riverside/San Bernardino**

Background

Region C spans the greatest number of square miles (46,504) of all regions, but encompasses only three counties. However, schools in this region are clustered in the southwest corner of the region and are within an hour of one another. Primarily a desert region, this region includes geographical attractions such as Death Valley and Kings Canyon National Park. Because of the desolate nature of much of this region, it is also home to a number of large weapons storage centers. The 12 partners in this region are located in two counties and are associated with nine school districts. All nine school districts serve students in grades K-12 and enroll anywhere from 3,810 to 36,844 students. Two schools also serve elementary students (3-8 and K-8) while the remaining ten schools serve middle grades only. The school enrollments range from 499 to 1113 students with the average enrollment per school being 792. The number of teachers per school ranges from 25 to 52.

Students served in Region C are ethnically similar to students statewide. The majority are white (54%) followed by Hispanic (33%). Although, as was the case in all regions, ethnic breakdowns differ by school. Over 50 percent of students are white in eight of the 12 schools. Yet in one school, nearly 100 percent of the students are Hispanic and only 28.5 percent of the students are from families where English is the only spoken language.

There was quite a range between schools in terms of the percentages of students from families receiving AFDC. While nearly one half of the student body at three schools come from families on AFDC (43% to 49%), other schools have AFDC percentages as low as two to nine percent.

In general, students in this region score below the state average on the CAP test, although students at one school performed well on the CAP test, scoring around the 80th percentile or higher. Several schools had scores around the fiftieth percentile. The remaining schools, however, scored in the lower quartile. One school scored below the tenth percentile on all subtests.

Description of the Foundation School

Shandin Hills Middle School is located in the San Bernardino hills. The school is about 20 years old and the campus is spacious and clean. The school changed its name from "Intermediate" to "Middle School" in year one of the project and in year two expanded to include grade six to its existing grades seven and eight.

The Foundation School has an ethnically diverse population with 25.7 percent of its students being Black and 31.9 percent Hispanic. Nearly half of the students are from families receiving AFDC. The students do not fare well on the CAP test; nearly all scores were in the lowest quartile.

To meet the needs of this challenging student population, staff at Shandin Hills were involved with middle grade reform long before they became a Foundation School. Five years earlier, the principal requested district support for middle grade reform. In response, the district allowed the principal to receive intensive training in middle grade reform in Florida and to develop a district plan for middle grade reform. A district published document entitled "Teaming in the Middle School" provides evidence of district support for the team concept. Shandin Hills fully implemented interdisciplinary teams at all grade levels in 1987, before it was designated a Foundation School. Other reform efforts such as a teacher-advisor program and two alternative programs for at-risk students have contributed to documented significant reductions in the suspension rates

(a 50 percent reduction in a three year period) and improvements in CAP scores.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Two hours per week

Title:	Foundation School Coordinator I
Position:	Foundation School resource teacher
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities
Time devoted:	Two hours per week

Title:	Foundation School Coordinator II
Position:	Foundation School resource teacher
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities
Time devoted:	One hour per week

Title:	Newsletter Editor
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Newsletter editor
Time devoted:	Unknown

Title:	Foundation-Partnership Liaison
Position:	Professor of Education, California State University, San Bernardino
Responsibilities:	Coordinator of regional conferences and student teachers
Time devoted:	Two hours per week

Committees

Title:	Steering Committee
Members:	All principals plus two teachers from each Partnership School
Function:	Develop and coordinate regional activities
Meeting Schedule:	Six to seven times per year

Title:	Planning Committee
Members:	Three Partnership School principals plus two teachers
Function:	Develop regional activities for approval of the steering committee
Meeting Schedule:	Two times per year

Title:	Drug Free Grant Committee
Members:	Three Partnership School principals
Function:	Coordinate drug free grant activities
Meeting Schedule:	Three to four times per year

Title:	Middle School conference committee
Members:	All Partnership School principals
Function:	Plan annual conference
Meeting Schedule:	As needed

Leadership in Region C is most strongly identified with individual leaders. Moreover, these leaders are not just confined to Foundation School staff. In contrast to other regions where individuals from Partnership Schools were usually identified as team or committee members, individuals from Partnership Schools in Region C, as well as the local university, were identified as individual leaders. No other region reported that a faculty member from a university was in a leadership position. Staff turnover was not an issue in Region C. Only one Partnership School principal moved to a new position at the end of year one.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By December, 1988, Region C will initiate on-going staff development in order to facilitate state-of-the-art middle school models.

2. By the 1992-1993 school year, all participating schools shall have implemented a program providing for one or more of the following:

   a. an interdisciplinary team organization
   b. a core grouping of two-five subject areas
   c. flexible blocks of instructional time.

3. Regional partnership schools will commit to involve parents, community, educators, businesses and institutions of higher education in a partnership to ensure student success in the middle school. This commitment shall include the development of a reciprocal model of involvement.

4. By January, 1989, a committee from each Partnership School will have contacted at least two (2) organizations listed in the appendix for the purpose of establishing linkages. Workshops will be planned to educate the school community about the middle school youngster and the educational program.

5. By 1992, all participating schools shall have implemented an advisory program providing students with an opportunity for intellectual, social, emotional and physical development.

6. By 1992, Partnership Schools will develop student-centered interdisciplinary curriculum integrating skills instruction with academic content.

7. By June 1992, Partnership Schools will define a common, comprehensive, academically-oriented curriculum in a balanced repertoire of subjects, determined by school, in line with Caught in the Middle criteria.

Schools in Region C identified seven very ambitious objectives, six of which pertained to specific program improvements. These six, if achieved over the three year period, would contribute to substantially improved educational programs for students in the middle grades.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Staff development was primarily carried out in a conference format. In December 1988, a one-day conference was held at a convention center in San Bernardino. The theme of the conference was "In the Middle and at the Top: Implementing Caught in the Middle". Over 550 faculty and parents attended the event which was co-sponsored by five other agencies including the local university, school district, County Superintendent's office and the COE. The conference coordinator was a professor of education at California State University, San Bernardino. One of the three keynote speakers at the conference was Jaime Escalante, calculus teacher at the predominantly Hispanic Garfield High

School in Los Angeles, and subject of the movie "Stand and Deliver". Breakout sessions were conducted by Partnership School staff, IHE faculty and other community resource persons.

A second conference was offered in fall, 1989. Again, the conference was co-sponsored by the same agencies as the preceding year and coordinated by the California State University, San Bernardino faculty member. This conference attracted 700 registered attendees. The theme was "Bridging Tomorrow's Needs Through Today's Minds". Breakout sessions were provided by IHE faculty, community resource persons and partners in the region.

Region C teachers have also participated in long-term training in the Class Project (for English, Science and Social Studies). Three trainers, who are teachers at three different Partnership Schools, provide training in this cross curriculum project. The Region participants have also begun intensive training in the California Literature Program and have scheduled planning sessions in the History Project. In addition, ongoing staff development opportunities are made available through a videotape library. Contained in this library (housed at the Foundation School) are tapes of inservices offered throughout the year at the various Partnership Schools. Finally teachers are invited to some regional meetings in order to increase teacher visitations among schools and to provide more opportunities for additional staff development.

Communication Strategies

Visitations to and from the Foundation School have served as a cornerstone of communication in this region. In both years one and two, the Foundation School principal and assistant visited every Partnership School in the region. Their presentations at these and other schools have been very well received as evidenced by numerous thank-you letters. In addition to opening general channels

of communication, these visits were used to conduct a needs assessment to identify strengths and areas needing improvement in each school. The needs assessment resulted in a description of the strengths and needs of each Partnership School for each area of emphasis identified in CIM (e.g., advisory community linkages, staff development, interdisciplinary teams). Distributed to all Partnership Schools it facilitated communication among schools with respect to their efforts to implement reform.

The Foundation School has welcomed a tremendous number of visitors to its site as well. For example, in January 1988 alone, 31 visitors came to the Foundation School. When visitors to the Foundation School come to see how interdisciplinary teaming and other reforms have been successfully implemented, they also learn about the regional network and middle grade reform. Visitors received a 42 page document entitled "Implementing the Middle School Concept" which describes the reform efforts being implemented at Shandin Hills. This impressive document was authored by the primary Foundation School Coordinator.

One newsletter was published the first year. Rather than continuing to publish a newsletter, regional participants now receive minutes of all regional meetings. Other communication efforts have included a telecommunications system. The telecommunications system selected is a part of the California State University Network, housed in San Bernardino; it became fully functional by year two.

Linkages

Region C has done a tremendous job establishing linkages with one COE and with California State University, San Bernardino. A representative from the COE attends every meeting and the COE has co-sponsored the regional conference each year.

IHE involvement preceded the formation of the regional networks but has gained intensity since the project began. The initial IHE involvement came from the placement of student teachers in the Foundation School. However, after the regional networks were established, the university decided to place student teachers only in Partnership Schools in the region, presumably because of the middle grade reform occurring at these schools. The Foundation School is also involved in a number of university-sponsored research projects including "Project Upbeat" which encourages students underrepresented in college enrollments to attend college. Initiated by Shandin Hills, Project Upbeat provides lectures for both parents and students at CSU, San Bernardino.

One professor of education has been highly involved in the region by coordinating student teacher placement and chairing the regional conferences each year. This professor also devoted sabbatical time to assist the Partnership Schools in their reform efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region C has accomplished a great deal in terms of its processes, particularly in the area of linkages. Meticulous in their organization and planning, a region-developed time-line of events and responsibilities shows the activities which have occurred within the region. The thoughtful and enthusiastic leadership in this region has contributed to the well-documented successes in this region.

The following recommendations are offered as a means of further strengthening regional accomplishments.

- Invite teachers to visit the school hosting the regular regional meeting.
- Develop a directory of exemplary programs and practices.

- Continue and expand long term staff development for teachers (e.g., CLASS Project, California Literature Project).

REGION C

8/7/89

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
SHANDIN HILLS MIDDLE	992	07-08	992	51	SAN BERNARDINO	36,844	KK-12
ARROWVIEW MIDDLE	879	07-08	879	45	SAN BERNARDINO	36,844	KK-12
BOBBY G. DUKE ELEMENTAR	847	06-08	824	39	RIVERSIDE	8,230	KK-12
BRIGGS (LYLE S.) FUNDAM	662	KK-08	295	32	SAN BERNARDINO	17,803	KK-12
CURTIS MIDDLE	1,113	07-08	1,107	52	SAN BERNARDINO	36,844	KK-12
ELSINORE JUNIOR HIGH	499	07-08	499	25	RIVERSIDE	4,330	07-12
JURUPA JUNIOR HIGH	1,043	07-08	1,043	44	RIVERSIDE	13,944	KK-12
LA CONTENTA JUNIOR HIGH	658	07-08	658	30	SAN BERNARDINO	8,889	KK-12
PALM DESERT MIDDLE	825	06-08	820	38	RIVERSIDE	13,800	KK-12
PINACATE MIDDLE	635	07-US	618	27	RIVERSIDE	3,810	07-12
SOUTHRIDGE MIDDLE	753	03-08	340	40	SAN BERNARDINO	19,057	KK-12
TERRACE HILLS JUNIOR HI	608	07-08	596	31	SAN BERNARDINO	14,002	KK-12

REGION C

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
SHANDIN HILLS MIDDLE	36.2	25.7	31.9	6.2	87.6	.	49.1	.	79.3
ARROWVIEW MIDDLE	33.2	18.8	42.1	6.0	88.2	.	44.2	.	83.4
BOBBY G. DUKE ELEMENTAR	1.2	0.2	97.8	0.8	92.5	18.1	18.1	22.3	28.5
BRIGGS (LYLE S.) FUNDAM	80.5	1.4	16.2	2.0	95.1	2.2	2.2	88.3	83.1
CURTIS MIDDLE	44.6	17.0	30.4	8.1	85.2	.	43.1	.	94.3
ELSINORE JUNIOR HIGH	73.9	3.0	20.6	2.4	89.2	.	20.7	.	90.6
JURUPA JUNIOR HIGH	70.0	3.6	24.4	1.9	90.3	.	11.5	.	97.8
LA CONTENTA JUNIOR HIGH	90.3	0.6	7.6	1.6	89.4	.	.	.	98.3
PALM DESERT MIDDLE	77.6	1.0	16.2	5.2	93.1	6.2	6.2	82.5	85.2
PINACATE MIDDLE	54.3	12.8	32.4	0.5	89.0	.	.	.	86.5
SOUTHRIDGE MIDDLE	58.0	6.8	31.9	3.3	94.7	.	.	94.7	92.4
TERRACE HILLS JUNIOR HI	55.3	7.4	30.9	6.4	91.9	.	9.4	.	97.0

REGION C

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
SHANDIN HILLS MIDDLE	.	.	.	24	17	24	18	25	27
ARROWVIEW MIDDLE	.	.	.	17	20	13	19	23	19
BOBBY G. DUKE ELEMENTAR	3	5	6	1	3	4	3	4	2
BRIGGS (LYLE S.) FUNDAM	85	81	83	76	88	62	77	82	80
CURTIS MIDDLE	.	.	.	26	15	19	17	30	29
ELSINORE JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	21	18	25	36	40	44
JURUPA JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	35	32	26	35	36	27
LA CONTENTA JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	52	48	35	49	55	39
PALM DESERT MIDDLE	41	44	40	54	54	58	55	64	71
PINACATE MIDDLE	.	.	.	37	23	16	26	25	19
SOUTHRIDGE MIDDLE	72	45	66	49	42	49	47	37	34
TERRACE HILLS JUNIOR HI	.	.	.	56	56	48	54	44	40

Appendix D

Region D: San Diego/Imperial Counties

Background

Region D is a moderately sized region encompassing two counties, both of which border Mexico. Separating the two counties is the Borrego Desert State Park. Both counties are highly populated; the 11 partners reside within eight separate school districts which enroll from 755 to 111,198 students. Five districts are unified (serving K-12 students); four districts serve students in grades seven to twelve. Four schools serve grades seven and eight; five serve grades seven to nine; and two serve grades six to eight. School enrollments range from 201 to 1,452, with the average number of students per school being 868. The number of teachers per school ranges from ten to 73.

It is not surprising, given Region D's proximity to the Mexican border, that there are higher proportions of Hispanic students in this region (38.5%) than are found statewide (30.1%). In five schools, 50 percent or more of the students are Hispanic and in five other schools 50 percent or more of the students are white. In the remaining school, just less than half of the students are Asian. This is the highest proportion of Asian students seen in any Partnership or Foundation School. The percent of eighth grade students from families receiving AFDC cluster around 25 percent in four schools, which is considerably higher than the state average of 13.6 percent.

Students in Region D score across the board on the CAP test. Students at two schools perform well, scoring at the eightieth percentile or higher while students at two schools perform poorly, scoring in the lowest quartile. The remaining schools scored in the second and third quartiles.

Description of the Foundation School

Montgomery Junior High School enrolls around 1,400 students in grades seven through nine. The school is neat and clean, and is located a few miles north of the U.S. Mexico International Border. Fewer than half of the students at Montgomery are from families where English is the only spoken language: 50.3 percent of the students are Hispanic, 27.7 percent are Filipino and 17.9 percent are white. The percentage of students from families receiving AFDC is lower than the state average. CAP scores are slightly below the state average.

Middle grade reform effort at the Foundation School preceded its involvement in the regional networks by about five years. The school's motto, "First in Excellence, First in Pride" accurately describes the reform emphasis at the school. Efforts to implement effective schools' research findings had long been underway, so the application to become a Foundation School was completed in order to receive recognition for prior efforts as well as to provide encouragement to continue. Examples of exemplary programs at this school are numerous, and are described in the 106 page document produced by the Foundation School Coordinator which provides "An Overview of School Programs and Activities Used to Implement the Recommendations of Caught in the Middle." For example, the Parent Volunteer Program brings parents into the school to assist with the Opportunity Class, to assist teachers, and to help with school activities. The Study Organizational System (S.O.S.) is a study skills program which involves parents in their student's academic work. A 52 page booklet for parents provides information to parents on how to help their child succeed in school.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Coordinator of Partnership Network
Position:	Foundation School computer resource teacher
Responsibilities:	Support regional activities, make presentations to community and professional groups, maintain the directory of exemplary programs
Time devoted:	Twenty hours per week
Title:	Leader of Student Potential task force
Position:	Foundation School intervention coordinator
Responsibilities:	Facilitate task force, plan mini-symposium on at-risk students
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Leader of Instructional Practice Task Force
Position:	Foundation School English teacher
Responsibilities:	Facilitate task force, host visitors interested in teaming
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Foundation School Secretary
Position:	Foundation School Secretary
Responsibilities:	Assist regional activities in clerical and administrative matters
Time devoted:	Twenty hours per week
Title:	Foundation School Team Member
Position:	Foundation School English teacher/ middle school coordinator
Responsibilities:	Professional support for regional activities
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Foundation School Team Member
Position:	Foundation School assistant principal
Responsibilities:	Professional support for regional activities
Time devoted:	Two hours per week
Title:	Foundation School Team Member
Position:	Foundation School math resource teacher
Responsibilities:	Professional support for regional activities
Time devoted:	One hour per week

Committees

Title:	Foundation School Team
Members:	Individual leaders at the Foundation School
Function:	To coordinate regional activities; host visitors, maintain a clearinghouse of information
Meeting Schedule:	Weekly

Title:	Instructional Practices task force
Members:	Principal or teacher from each Partnership School
Function:	Encourage and facilitate implementation of active learning strategies via videotapes, discussion groups, newsletters, and visitations
Meeting Schedule:	Three annual regional meetings; regular meetings every two months

Title:	Scheduling task force
Members:	Principal or teacher from each Partnership School
Function:	To encourage equal access for all students, focusing on teacher training and credentialing issues
Meeting Schedule:	Three annual regional meetings; regular meetings every two months

Title:	Student Potential task force
Members:	Principal or teacher from each Partnership School
Function:	To encourage implementation of programs, practices and policies which maximize student potential
Meeting Schedule:	Three annual regional meetings; regular meetings every two months

Region D identifies eight individuals as regional leaders. All leaders are on staff at the Foundation School and compose what is referred to as the Foundation School team. This team meets weekly to coordinate and manage the regional activities. No other Foundation School has a formal team of staff to work on Foundation School activities.

Region D does not identify a "steering committee" consisting of principals from all partnership schools, as is found in other regions. Rather, the responsibilities of such a committee are conducted during the simultaneous meeting of the three task forces.

Staff turnover was not a problem in this region, although, three Partnership principals did move to new positions.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. Enhance and facilitate communication between regional Partnership Schools, COEs, IHEs, and other organizations through site visitations, telecommunications, printed material, and audio-visual material.

2. Establish and maintain personal linkages and staff development activities to enhance and facilitate regional problem solving, sharing, and common focus.

3. Communicate with district offices, Boards of Education, and IHEs to solicit assistance and support for reform efforts (student teachers, credentialing changes, pre-service experiences, classes, etc).

4. By 1990-1991 the participating schools will implement programs that address emotional, physical, and social characteristics of adolescents.

5. By 1990-1991 all participating schools will identify at-risk students and will develop programs which meet the needs of these students and provide them equal access to all areas of the curriculum.

6. By 1991-1992 all network schools will have implemented intervention programs addressing the needs of the middle school at-risk student. Possible interventions include student study teams, the School Attendance Review Board (SARB), advisories, motivation and maintenance (M & M), opportunity classes, Saturday school, alternative school, attendance monitoring, parent and community involvement, substance abuse prevention, peer counseling, and on-site credentialed counselors.

7. Provide network activities to encourage implementation of effective instructional proactives that meet the needs of young adolescents and that facilitate the achievement of middle grades reform. Schools in the network will collaborate according to strengths and needs.

8. By January, 1992, each Partnership School will develop a master schedule that reflects the philosophy of Caught in the Middle to promote equal access to all students.

9. By the 1990-1991 school year, each Partnership School will have at least one interdisciplinary team in place.

10. By 1992 each Partnership School will reflect the ideas for organization and structure recommended for reform in middle school education.

At first glance it appears that Region D has set a very ambitious agenda in terms of goals to accomplish. However, a careful examination of the ten objectives shows that several overlap. For example, the first three objectives all pertain to the concept of "linkages." In general, however, Region D has high expectations for the three year project. In addition, to establishing linkages with various agencies, the Region's intent is to improve services for at-risk students, to implement interdisciplinary teams, to modify master schedules according to the recommendations in CIM, to provide innovative programs for middle grade students, and to align its perspectives with those found in middle grade reform.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Region D sponsored a day-long regional symposium in January, 1989. The theme of the symposium was "Choosing the Right Key for At-Risk Students". The keynote speakers were Dr. Bettie Youngs (Professor at San Diego State University) who spoke on "Student Potential is What is Caught in the Middle", and Pat Deikel (Lead teacher, high risk program, Royal High School) who spoke on "Who are These Kids and What Will We Do with Them?" This symposium was attended by about 250 educators. Mini-sessions on gangs, substance abuse, self-esteem and academic success were also offered.

In the fall of year two a symposium with the theme "Spotlight in our Partnership" was attended by 450 educators. Howard Johnston, from the University of Cincinnati, addressed the topic of equal access through a presentation entitled, "A Culture and Climate on Effective Schools-Assuring Success for All Students." Partnership School principals and teachers presented 32 breakout

sessions. This conference was favorably covered in the local media and a columnist wrote: "Principal Demos and his staff are to be commended for what they are doing for the future generations of our adult citizenry."

In addition, to the regional symposium, three annual regional meetings were held jointly by all three task forces. At these meetings, information specific to each task force was shared. Region D also makes videotapes of the "Lesson of the Month". These tapes provide an efficient means of classroom observation; each month a new tape is routed through the schools.

Communication Strategies

Many of the communication strategies implemented by Region D contribute directly to the education of educators. Newsletters included feature stories about exemplary programs and practices in Partnership Schools. The "Network News" is one of the most impressive newsletters in the state. The desktop publishing of this newsletter is highly professional, complete with the region logo and graphics throughout the test. Most impressive, however, is the substantive content of the newsletters. The May-June 1990 (Vol VI) issue contained success stories of students once considered at risk of dropping out. The articles written both by faculty and the students themselves profiled the factors which contributed to the turn-around of the students. In addition to the Network News, Region D "Updates" are published to communicate information between publications of the Newsletter.

A directory of Special Programs, 100 pages in length, was also published bringing attention to the innovative programs in the region. This directory was to be used as a guide for identifying schools to visit or to contact regarding programs of interest. Organized into chapters based on the principals in CIM, the directory provides detailed descriptions of programs offered at each school.

For example, the chapter on Physical and Emotional Development includes descriptions of a Teen Connection Club, a Personal Absence Contract Program, a Student Advisory Program and ten other innovative programs. Well organized and professional in appearance, this directory could serve as an excellent model for other regions currently publishing directories.

Visitations have been strongly encouraged in this region. The Foundation School has a highly professional videotaped presentation which is shown to all visitors. This tape shows the exemplary programs in effect at the Foundation School, educates the visitor on middle grade reform, and describes the regional network. Visitors are also provided with the 106-page document entitled "An Overview of School Programs and Activities Used to Implement the Recommendations in Caught in the Middle.

Regional partners have extended considerable effort to publicize Region D activities through presentations made at community and professional organizations. In addition, a "traveling road show" composed of student actors, designed to promote drug abuse awareness was developed. This show will be presented at all Partnership Schools and perhaps at other schools in the regions as well.

The previous examples point to communication between regional partners and the community. In addition, Region D was one of the first regions to set up a telecommunications system. The author of FrEd Writer and the system operator of an electronic bulletin board provided training to the partners in the region. Although this system is now in effect, only about half of the schools are actively using it.

Linkages

Linkages between IHEs and the partners in Region D have resulted in significant contributions to both educational training and policy. Region D's primary IHE relationship is with San Diego State University (SDSU). Faculty from SDSU have provided training and consultation to partners in the region on a number of occasions. In addition, as a result of meetings on teacher preparation between the Scheduling Task Force and representatives from SDSU, a proposal to develop a master's degree program with an emphasis on middle grade education is being considered at that University. In terms of policy, the Scheduling Task Force also made formal recommendations to the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing. Also, a linkage has been established with Point Loma Nazarene College; faculty there will participate in the year three symposium.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is difficult to capture the essence of the reform activities and efforts extended during the past two years in Region D. A review of their newsletters and Updates reveals a multitude of activities involving a large number of individuals. The region has clearly embraced the reform movement fully.

Region D committees have contributed significantly to the many accomplishments during the past two years. In particular, their active involvement in effecting change in teacher training is excellent. This type of accomplishment can be widespread in its impact. It is recommended that Region D:

- Continue to work cooperatively with IHEs and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Continue efforts to establish a working relationship with the COE.
- Incorporate teacher visitations with the regional meetings.

REGION D

8/1/89

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	1,365	07-09	940	69	SAN DIEGO	26,877	07-12
CORREIA JUNIOR HIGH	877	07-08	877	42	SAN DIEGO	111,198	KK-12
DIEGUENO JUNIOR HIGH	944	07-09	640	50	SAN DIEGO	6,263	07-12
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	855	07-09	578	49	SAN DIEGO	111,198	KK-12
NATIONAL CITY JUNIOR HI	1,023	07-09	690	51	SAN DIEGO	26,077	07-12
OAK GROVE MIDDLE	268	06-08	268	14	SAN DIEGO	755	*
SOUTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH	1,142	07-09	795	54	SAN DIEGO	26,077	07-12
VALLEY JUNIOR HIGH	789	07-08	764	39	SAN DIEGO	5,900	KK-12
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	1,452	06-08	1,452	73	SAN DIEGO	15,636	KK-12
WORTH (BARBARA) JUNIOR	642	07-08	642	34	IMPERIAL	3,312	KK-08
WRIGHT (FRANK M.) ELEME	201	07-08	201	10	IMPERIAL	1,265	KK-12

REGION D

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	17.9	4.1	50.3	27.7	0.0	.	11.9	.	43.4
CORREIA JUNIOR HIGH	51.3	8.4	36.1	4.2	92.6	.	21.3	.	77.0
DIEGUENO JUNIOR HIGH	87.1	0.4	9.1	3.4	93.9	.	2.6	.	91.9
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	30.9	4.6	15.1	49.5	93.1	.	28.9	.	51.8
NATIONAL CITY JUNIOR HI	12.4	4.0	71.0	12.6	0.0	.	29.8	.	35.5
OAK GROVE MIDDLE	85.8	0.0	13.1	1.1	94.6	3.1	3.1	83.4	92.0
SOUTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH	20.7	3.3	60.9	15.1	0.0	.	24.9	.	35.0
VALLEY JUNIOR HIGH	76.6	1.8	18.0	3.8	94.7	.	5.6	.	90.7
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	70.7	5.2	18.3	5.8	93.3	5.8	5.8	82.0	82.6
WORTH (BARBARA) JUNIOR	17.9	4.2	77.7	0.2	93.3	.	14.4	.	49.1
WRIGHT (FRANK M.) ELEME	43.8	5.0	50.7	0.5	94.0	.	7.1	.	56.4

86

REGION D

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	44	51	46	46	36	43
CORREIA JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	54	52	56	42	51	29
DIEGUENO JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	93	92	97	94	94	85
MONTGOMERY JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	35	48	61	40	36	3
NATIONAL CITY JUNIOR HI	.	.	.	23	36	26	27	16	56
OAK GROVE MIDDLE	78	72	66	81	80	53	80	62	78
SOUTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	37	29	28	26	31	36
VALLEY JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	91	89	79	88	86	84
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	53	51	66	51	56	57	63	72	52
WORTH (BARBARA) JUNIOR	.	.	.	13	11	19	16	14	18
WRIGHT (FRANK M.) ELEME	.	.	.	21	25	28	21	20	7

Appendix E

Region E: Orange County

Background

Region E is the smallest region, encompassing only 785 square miles and one county, Orange County. Orange County is a densely-populated middle-to-upper class metropolitan area bordered on the western side by the Pacific Coastline. Primary geographical attractions in this region include the Santa Ana Mountains and Laguna Beach.

The 13 partners in this region are associated with 12 different districts. Districts range in size from 4,435 to 38,459; eight districts serve students in grades K-12 and four serve students in grades K-8. All schools serve middle grade students only, with six schools serving grades six to eight and seven schools serving grades seven and eight. School enrollments range from 578 to 1,360 with the average number of students per school being 922. The number of teachers per school range from 31 to 64.

Initially, there were 12 partners in this region associated with 11 different districts. In April of the first year, Killingsworth school (from ABC Unified in Region G) was transferred to Region E because of its geographical proximity to Orange County, and because its school personnel were participating in staff development activities offered through Orange County rather than through Los Angeles County. In addition, the principal from Killingsworth was involved in California School Leadership Academy training with other principals from the Region E network. Because this transfer occurred after the regions were formed, quantitive data for Killingsworth are combined with data for schools in Region G rather than Region E.

Students in Region E differ from students statewide in several ways. There is a higher proportion of white students (60.6%) than is found statewide (50.1%), far fewer Black students (2.3%) compared with the statewide percentage (9.1%) and fewer Hispanic students (25.6%) than are found statewide (30.1%). There are slightly higher percentages of Asian students (10.6%) than are found statewide (7.3%). The percent of students from families receiving AFDC in this region is low, with the highest percentage being 11.6 percent in one school and half the schools reporting less than 2 percent on AFDC. Students at ten out of 13 schools performed extremely well on the CAP test, scoring in the upper quartile. Students at three schools performed at or below the 50 percentile.

Description of the Foundation School

Dwyer enrolls about 700 students in grades six to eight. The students are primarily white (76.7%) and CAP scores are in the fourth quartile. The neighborhood demographics at this school are highly diverse including both ocean-front homes and low-income housing. The school facility is clean and many classrooms have an ocean view.

The district superintendent encouraged the Foundation School principal to apply to become a Partnership School and then a Foundation School. Although, the school has had four principals and nine vice principals in the past five years, staff were cognizant of and committed to middle grade reform. Many innovative educational programs are in effect at this school. For example, a school/business partnership with the McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company supports a program entitled the Teaching for Thinking Program, that teaches students higher level thought processes (analysis, synthesis and evaluation). Staff development is provided for staff and parents interested in the program. This program received a Golden-Bell award in 1988 and the school was named

California Distinguished School in 1988.

The Foundation School principal assumed a new position at the end of year one. The partners in the region then selected one of the Partnership School principals to act as the Network Coordinator. Thus, although the Foundation School was responsible for channeling funding to the Partnership Schools, individual leadership was not located at the Foundation School in year two.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal (1988-89)
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Manage budget and act as CDE liaison for fiscal matters
Time devoted:	Four hours per week
Title:	Network Coordinator (1989-90)
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate Regional Activities, represent region at state-level meetings
Time devoted:	Four hours per week
Title:	Region Leader for Foundation School
Position:	Foundation School assistant principal
Responsibilities:	Represent school at regional activities until new Foundation School principal was hired
Time devoted:	Two hours per week until January 1990
Title:	Accountant, Region E
Position:	Director of Financial Services, Huntington Beach City School District
Responsibilities:	Reimburse Region E schools
Time devoted:	Four hours per week

Committees

Title:	Leadership Team
Members:	All principals, some teachers, counselors and administrators, COE representatives
Function:	Plan and implement Regional objectives
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Equal Access Symposium Committee
Members:	Four principals & two teachers
Function:	Plan and organize December 1989 symposium on Equal Access
Meeting Schedule:	Every two months until December 1989; inactive from there on

Title:	Drug Free Schools Implementation Committee
Members:	Mix of principals, counselors, psychologists and teachers
Function:	Develop and implement regional plan to involve students from all schools in a monthly program to stop substance abuse.
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Communications Committee
Members:	Five principals
1988-89 Function:	Produce newsletter
1989-90 Function:	Develop regional communication plan
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Staff Development Committee
Members:	Five principals, county representative and Director of Teacher Center
1988-89 Function:	Conduct needs assessment of staff development needs and publicize staff development opportunities
1989-90 Function:	Publicize staff development opportunities and plan monthly inservice at regular meetings
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Budget Committee
Members:	Three principals
Function:	Establish budget, monitor expenditures and provide reimbursements to schools, provide monthly update at network meetings
Meeting:	Monthly

Region E adjusted to a leadership change in year two at the Foundation School very efficiently. The Region E Foundation School principal left in June, 1989 and a replacement was not found until December, 1989. However, the leadership team elected its own "Network Coordinator". This action was evidence of the commitment the Partnership School principals had made to the Network. They were not willing to passively accept an unknown entity as their "leader" so they took matters into their own hands. Even though the new principal selected for the Foundation School was formerly a Partnership School principal

in the same region, he will not assume the role of the Foundation School principal (i.e. coordinate regional events) until year three, and only then if he is elected. In addition to the loss of the Foundation School principal, three Partnership School principals moved to new positions.

Region E is an example of a truly democratic network, an arrangement that accommodated the transition at the Foundation School very well. It was reported that: "In Region E all principals share responsibility equally. This includes serving on committees, preparing monthly agendas, sending out minutes of meetings, or preparing presentations." This sharing of responsibility is shown by the number of committees and the various types of individuals (e.g., principals, teachers, COE representatives) serving on these committees.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By June 1991, the teachers of Region E Partnership Schools will participate in staff development and inservice programs designed to enhance classroom instructional practices emphasizing active learning strategies.

2. By June, 1991, the network will support the development of programs at each Partnership School which address the needs of "at-risk" students.

3. By June, 1991, the Region E Partnership Schools will increase the number of programs in each school that rely on curricular collaboration by staff members.

Region E partners identified three objectives specific to content recommendations found in CIM.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Region E sponsored a Saturday conference in December, 1989, with the theme "Equal Access is Possible". This conference was attended by educators who

attended a variety of breakout sessions and listened to Henry Gradillas, former principal of Garfield High School in Los Angeles, speak on the topic of equal access. The region also hired Dr. Tom Harvey, Dean of Educational Management at the University of LaVerne, to do an all-day inservice on "Creating and Controlling Change" for leadership teams from each of the Partnership Schools. It was held at the Huntington Beach Teacher Center, formerly a federally-funded Teacher Center for Staff Development.

Other staff development opportunities were provided by the Huntington Beach Teacher Center as well as by individual schools which allowed open enrollment at their inservices. Further, monthly regional meetings include a workshop for teachers, the topic of which is based upon the strengths of the host school. In addition, this spring ('90) school counselors and groups of five students from each school have been convening at the monthly regional meeting on their own agenda for alcohol and drug abuse prevention and training students to be catalysts in their own schools.

Communication Strategies

A needs assessment designed to identify school strengths and weaknesses was conducted relative to the five main parts of CIM. A graph was developed which cursorily described the steps taken by each school toward achieving reform in each area. The intent was to provide a means for schools to identify other schools with programs they'd like to implement.

Region E was one of the first networks to get a regional telecommunication network set up using FrEd Mail. However, it has not been widely used, and efforts are underway to train and encourage principals to use the system on a day-to-day basis. It is hoped that the situation will change now that all 115 schools can link into the PrevNet system with their Alcohol and Drug Abuse

Prevention monies.

The region published their first newsletter in the Spring of year one. It contained descriptions of each Partnership School. In addition to a newsletter, Region E distributed copies of minute meetings as a means of keeping partners abreast of Network activities.

Linkages

In order to establish closer linkages with the district offices represented in the Partnership, a luncheon was hosted by the Partnership in the spring of year one. The purpose of the luncheon was two-fold: to recognize the principals for their outstanding leadership and to give the superintendents an update on the Network's progress.

Region E established a strong linkage with the Huntington Beach Teacher Center and the County Office of Education. The director of the Teacher Center and the middle grades contact person from the COE have been active participants in regional activities. They are present at each meeting and have played major roles in meeting the staff development needs of the region. The director of the Teacher Center did a staff development needs assessment for the region and made arrangements for offerings to address the identified needs through the Teacher Center. The COE offered a CLASS Project training of trainers for teams of three from each (all ten) of the regional networks at no cost to the networks. At least four of the ten networks have used these trainers to do CLASS Project training for teachers in their respective networks. IHE's have not been actively involved in this network although there is continued effort to establish a relationship with at least one IHE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The sense of camaraderie and shared commitment to the Network is tremendous in this region, and it has contributed to their achievements thus far. Continuation of current efforts is recommended and implementation of the following:

- Continue to seek connection with an IHE, particularly those responsible for training middle grade teachers.
- Begin to routinely use the now-functional telecommunications network.

REGION E

8/7/89

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
DWYER (ETHEL) MIDDLE	764	06-08	739	36	ORANGE	5,345	KK-08
EL RANCHO JUNIOR HIGH	864	07-08	864	40	ORANGE	23,387	KK-12
IMPERIAL MIDDLE	714	06-08	685	40	ORANGE	4,435	KK-08
LADERA VISTA JUNIOR HIG	692	07-08	692	39	ORANGE	10,124	KK-08
MAC ARTHUR (DOUGLAS) FU	996	06-08	996	41	ORANGE	38,459	KK-12
MC AULIFFE (SHARON CHRI	1,285	06-08	1,285	72	ORANGE	5,818	KK-12
RIDGECREST INTERMEDIATE	978	06-08	978	44	LOS ANGELES	9,583	KK-12
SERRANO INTERMEDIATE	1,360	07-08	1,325	60	ORANGE	22,390	KK-12
SPURGEON INTERMEDIATE	1,320	06-08	1,310	64	ORANGE	38,459	KK-12
TUFFREE (COL. J. K.) JU	655	07-08	655	35	ORANGE	17,700	KK-12
VENADO MIDDLE	818	07-08	818	39	ORANGE	20,025	KK-12
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	619	06-08	598	31	ORANGE	4,435	KK-08

96

REGION E

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
DWYER (ETHEL) MIDDLE	76.7	0.7	11.6	10.9	92.6	7.9	7.9	86.0	85.3
EL RANCHO JUNIOR HIGH	78.4	1.3	6.5	13.8	94.2	.	1.2	.	90.1
IMPERIAL MIDDLE	46.8	0.6	47.1	5.6	94.1	6.6	6.6	69.2	76.0
LADERA VISTA JUNIOR HIG	61.4	1.3	28.9	8.4	93.8	.	3.9	.	79.7
MAC ARTHUR (DOUGLAS) FU	37.6	6.3	45.9	10.2	94.4	6.7	6.7	61.4	60.2
MC AULIFFE (SHARON CHRI	86.6	1.6	6.1	5.7	93.6	1.6	1.6	91.7	84.5
RIDGECREST INTERMEDIATE	62.8	1.9	2.4	32.9	96.1	0.1	0.1	66.6	71.2
SERRANO INTERMEDIATE	82.6	1.8	6.8	8.8	95.0	.	0.9	.	94.8
SPURGEON INTERMEDIATE	2.9	5.5	82.3	9.5	89.6	11.6	11.6	12.5	18.2
TUFFREE (COL. J. K.) JU	80.8	1.5	10.1	7.6	94.7	.	0.9	.	91.9
VENADO MIDDLE	70.7	1.6	8.8	18.9	95.8	.	1.3	.	83.4
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	49.8	0.8	44.3	5.2	94.1	4.7	4.7	60.1	65.9

REGION E

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
DWYER (ETHEL) MIDDLE	79	73	70	86	80	79	84	89	91
EL RANCHO JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	81	79	77	84	77	66
IMPERIAL MIDDLE	61	74	66	44	50	62	46	38	43
LADERA VISTA JUNIOR HIG	.	.	.	72	69	69	73	72	66
MAC ARTHUR (DOUGLAS) FU	66	78	74	80	91	83	77	80	82
MC AULIFFE (SHARON CHRI	84	85	82	87	85	87	88	93	70
RIDGECREST INTERMEDIATE	96	90	97	96	97	98	96	95	98
SERRANO INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	89	87	92	93	95	95
SPURGEON INTERMEDIATE	12	17	15	33	36	30	24	27	26
TUFFREE (COL. J. K.) JU	.	.	.	82	86	89	83	79	82
VENADO MIDDLE	.	.	.	87	92	88	89	83	93
WASHINGTON MIDDLE	48	60	50	60	62	77	62	49	60

98

Appendix F

Region F: Los Angeles Unified School District

Background

Region F is unique within the state in general and differs from all other regions. All schools in Region F are in urban locations and all are part of one school district, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), the second largest district in the country, serving 600,000 students.

The schools in this region face innumerable challenges related to the high population density of the area and the high proportions of Black and Hispanic students. Although it is the second smallest region containing only 815 square miles (which is only .5 percent of the state), this region serves 19.4 percent of the students served in Partnership and Foundation Schools. Travel distance between schools is within 60 miles, but road congestion can easily lead to a long commute time.

All schools in this region serve students in the middle grades only, with three serving students in grades seven to nine, six serving students in grades six to eight, and one serving students in grades six to nine. The schools in this region are the largest in the state with the enrollment ranging from 937 to 4043, the average enrollment was 1,716. The number of teachers per school ranges from 44 to 193.

The vast majority of students in Region F are Hispanic (73.1%). This percentage is extremely high compared with the statewide percentage of Hispanics (30.1%). The percentage of Black students in this region is also high (15.1%) compared with the average percentage of Black students statewide (9.1%). Only 8 percent of the students in this region are white whereas 50.1 percent of the

students statewide are white. Further, the ethnic mix in schools is not uniform. Two schools served primarily Black students and five schools served primarily Hispanic students. In six schools, fewer than 50 percent of the students are from families where English is the only language spoken; accordingly, these schools must address significant language needs. The percent of eighth grade students from families receiving AFDC ranged widely with two schools reporting over 80 percent of their students from families receiving AFDC and three schools with fewer than 15 percent of their students from families receiving AFDC.

Most students in this region performed extremely poorly on the CAP test. In seven schools, test scores were below the 10th percentile with a large number of subtest scores in the first percentile. One school had test scores which hovered around the 50th percentile.

Description of Foundation School

Bret Harte Junior High is a large inner-city school which enrolls over 1,000 students in grades six to eight. The three story brick building is clean of graffiti and has numerous murals and other amenities which contribute to a pleasant school environment. Most of the students are Black (73.5%) and nearly all students in grades 6 and 8 are from families receiving AFDC (93%). Students at this school score below the 10th percentile on all CAP subtests.

In year one of the project, the Foundation School principal at Bret Harte served in a leadership capacity for the regional network. In year two, because the Foundation School principal retired, a Partnership School principal served as Network Coordinating principal; in year three, another Partnership School principal will be elected to serve in this capacity.

District Involvement

All schools in this region were affiliated with the Los Angeles Unified

School District (LAUSD), providing opportunity for dedicated district involvement in the regional network. Thus, this made the model of middle grade reform in Region F different from that adopted by any other region. Region F elected to implement an agenda which focused on district-wide reform with emphasis on district-level policies and practices, whereas other regions implemented an agenda which focused on region-wide reform with emphasis on the school-site level. In no other region was the district a formal partner in the reform effort. As such, it is difficult to compare Region F's accomplishments with those of other regions.

In response to the formation of Region F, the Los Angeles District Office of Instruction created the full-time position of Administrator, Middle/Junior High Schools. The individual holding this position was to directly facilitate the regional participants in their regional activities (representing about one quarter of the job description responsibilities) and to disseminate the successful practices of the network schools to all other middle grade schools in the district (representing about three quarters of the job description). The next section provides a more detailed discussion of the district involvement unique to this region.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal (1988 - 89)
Position:	Foundation School principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities; represent region at state level meetings
Time devoted:	Four hours per week

Title:	Foundation School Coordinator (1988 - 89)
Position:	Foundation School Teacher
Responsibilities:	Coordinate region activities and school visitations
Time devoted:	Unknown

Title:	Administrator, Middle/Junior High Schools (1988 - 89)
Position:	District office administrator
Responsibilities:	Oversee network activities/get district approval for network activities
Time devoted:	Unknown

Title:	Network Coordinating Principal (1989 - 90)
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities; represent region at state level meetings.
Time devoted:	Three hours per week

Title:	Administrator, Middle/Junior High Schools (1989 - 90)
Position:	District office Administrator
Responsibilities:	Move district middle grade schools toward implementation of recommendations in CIM, using Foundation and Partnership Schools as catalysts
Time devoted:	Approximately two days per week directly with network schools; remaining time on all district middle and junior high schools

Committees

Title:	Staff Development (1988-89)
Members:	One from each school and district office coordinator (contact)
Function:	Plan retreat
Meeting Schedule:	Four times a year

Title:	Newsletter (1988-89)
Members:	Six to ten principals, administrators and teachers
Function:	Produce newsletter (in 1989-90 this function was assumed by the District Office of Instruction and newsletters were produced for all district schools serving middle grades)
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Telecommunications (1988 - 89)
Members:	Six to ten principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	To determine feasibility of connecting all Partnership Schools with telecommunications system
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Linkage (1988-89)
Members:	Principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function: and	To assess current linkage of Partnership Schools with IHEs community resources
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Communication (1988 - 89)
Members:	Six to 20 principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Review research on effective communication strategies
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Active Learning Strategies (began Feb. 1990)
Members:	Fifteen principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Plan and monitor activities related to topic
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Programs for At-Risk students (began Feb. 1990)
Members:	Nineteen principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Plan and monitor activities related to topic
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Restructuring via the Schedule/Heterogeneous Group/Teaming (began Feb. 1990)
Members:	Eighteen principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Plan and monitor activities related to topic
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Budget Committee (1988 - 89; 1989 - 90)
Members:	Six to ten principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Establish and monitor the budget
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Staff Development (1988-89; 1989-90)
Members:	Six to ten principals, assistant principals and teachers
Function:	Determine needs and plan staff development for all Partnership Schools; evaluate
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Without a careful reading of the descriptions of the many individuals and committees associated with this region, it would appear that there was an extremely high level of involvement in this region. However, the actual number of individuals and committees is doubled since half pertained only to year one (1988-89) and the other half pertained only to year two (1989-90). Region F underwent major changes with respect to its leadership from year one to year two. There were shifts in personnel occupying leadership positions at the school and the district level. Committees were also completely restructured in year two.

First, the retirement of the Foundation School principal prompted the recommendation from the district to assign the role of Network Coordinating

principal to rotating Partnership School principals, a different principal in year two, and again in year three. Individuals occupying the position of Network Coordinating principal were selected by the Partnership School principals. The responsibilities assumed by these Network Coordinating principals were parallel to those assumed by the Foundation School principal.

Second, district reassignments were responsible for the change in personnel in the district Administrator, Middle/Junior High Schools. The different perspectives of the two individuals occupying the job contributed to a shift in job responsibilities and emphases from year one to year two. During year one, assistance and guidance was provided directly to the Partnership Schools as they began their reform efforts. During year two, a more district-wide perspective emerged and an effort was made to disseminate the successful practices of the Partnership Schools to all schools in the region.

Committees were restructured in an effort to increase their effectiveness and productivity. In the first year, committees were established based on priorities identified in the first symposium. However, by the end of the year only two of the committees were reportedly functioning well. This was believed to be in part due to the foci of the committees, which were not well aligned to regional objectives. In year two, the committee structure was revised in February to better reflect the regional objectives. These committees are reportedly functioning well.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By 1992-93, all participating schools will provide a common, comprehensive academically oriented core curriculum for every middle grade student irrespective of primary language or ethnic background.

2. By 1992-93, all participating schools will provide instructional practices which emphasize active learning strategies taking into account the goals of the core curriculum and the developmental characteristics of young adolescents.

3. By 1992-93, all participating schools within Region F shall implement a program designed to increase student potential and maximize student self-esteem.

4. By 1992-93, all participating schools shall have implemented a master schedule which reflects equal access to all instructional programs and student support services for all students.

5. By 1992-93, middle grade teachers and principals will participate in a comprehensive, well-planned, long range staff development program which will emphasize professional collegiality.

The five regional objectives specified in the Region F plan addressed a variety of reform areas and were identified through the help of the district administrator. In contrast to the other regions where schools identified objectives unique to their own site needs, all schools in the region identified the same objectives in their school plans as in their region plan.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Two significant staff development activities occurred in the spring of year one (1989). First, a day-long retreat was held for principals and four teachers from each school in the regional network at the Holy Spirit Retreat Center. Jeanette Phillips, the president-elect of the National Middle School Association was the keynote speaker. Breakout sessions were facilitated by Foundation and Partnership School personnel. Topics covered in the breakout sessions included the change process, school structure and organization, heterogeneous grouping and active learning techniques.

In addition, the Far West Educational Laboratory conducted a day-long in

service on the process of change. Invitations were extended to all schools for this inservice. However, the Far West Educational Laboratory worked most closely with three specific schools in the San Fernando Valley and subsequent support on the process of change was provided only to these three schools.

Year two was also marked by a number of staff development activities. Before school opened in the fall of 1989, another inservice was provided for all regional network schools by the Far West Educational Laboratory at California State University at Northridge on leadership strategies. This meeting was attended by approximately 40 participants.

Also in the fall of 1989, a symposium featuring Dr. Joel Milgram was held. All principals and staff in schools with middle level grades in the district were invited, and over 600 attended to learn about the uniqueness of students between the ages of 11 and 14 and how to best meet the needs of those students.

An ongoing organization in the district, entitled "LAUSD Junior High Principals' Organization", devoted their March 1990 meeting to middle grade reform. The keynote speaker was Thaddeus Dumas, the Administrator of the CDE Office of Middle Grades Support Services. All 80 schools serving middle level grades were invited and over 100 educators attended this meeting. Attendees also attended a choice of three breakout sessions, lead by Foundation and Partnership principals.

By the Spring of 1990, the perceived importance of middle grade reform and the efforts of the district Administrator brought about a number of important changes in district policy which contribute to an increased opportunity for staff development for all middle-level educators in the district. A number of prior Board policies had severely limited opportunities for staff development. For example, it had been Board policy that conference expenditures could not

exceed $750 per school per year, that only 7 people per district-regional boundaries could attend staff development offerings simultaneously, and that only one person per school could attend staff development outside the state or country. These district policies were changed (for middle-level educators only) and as a result, over 1,200 middle grade teachers and administrators (close to 300 were from Partnership and Foundation Schools) were given the opportunity to attend the California League of Middle Schools conference held over a three-day period in Los Angeles.

Regional network monies were used to support Partnership and Foundation School attendance at this meeting. School Improvement Program monies were used by most other middle-grade schools to support the attendance of their staff. The region held its own three-hour meeting for teachers, administrators and parents during this three-day conference. The purpose of this meeting was to brainstorm on the current status and future goals of programs for students at risk of dropping out and on efforts to provide equal access to the core curriculum; nearly 200 people attended this meeting.

All Partnership and Foundation Schools were also involved in visitations. The district encouraged schools to host visitations at the time of the CLMS conference described above. Seven out of the ten schools were among the 40 schools on the CLMS visitation schedule during the conference described above. The structure and logistics of these visitations were coordinated by the Partnership School being visited. In addition, every Partnership School reportedly sent teachers to visit other Partnership Schools as well as selected non-partnership schools.

Communication Strategies

Regional meetings were held monthly, interrupted only briefly by a teacher

strike in the spring of the first year. The purpose of these meetings was to provide time for all committees to meet separately and for the Partnership School principals to meet as a group. Each Partnership School sent a number of representatives, including the principal, assistant principal and one or two teachers. Meetings were held at rotating Partnership Schools and the host school was responsible for orchestrating and leading the meeting.

In year one, the region published only one brief newsletter. In year two this responsibility was assumed by the district Office of Instruction. The result was the publication every other month of a highly professional newsletter entitled "The Turning Point", that focused on issues related to middle level education. The first newsletter was published in December 1989 and four were published during the spring of that year. This newsletter was distributed to over 8,000 educators in all schools in the district that serve middle grades. The newsletter served as an educational forum, highlighting articles on how to implement educational reform as recommended in CIM. In addition, in the second newsletter, the district Superintendent authored a piece entitled "1990: The Beginning of a Decade of Change in Middle Grade Education". This article established that the LAUSD has identified middle grade education as a priority for the 1990s. Other articles authored by Partnership School principals described reform efforts at individual schools.

Linkages

The Far West Regional Educational Laboratory has a close association with the three schools in the San Fernando valley in closest proximity with the Laboratory. This association has contributed to two formal staff development activities for all schools, and ongoing support for the three schools. In addition, a number of Partnership Schools reportedly have established linkages

with IHEs; the primary service provided by IHEs has been with respect to students at risk of dropping out and underrepresented minorities.

District-Level Diffusion

The district-level focus in this region has resulted in a major change in the district organization and emphasis. Evidence of a shift in priority and attention at the district level to middle level reform is found in the following examples:

- The Office of Instruction publicly declared middle grade education as a major priority.
- A full-time position for Administrator, Middle/Junior High Schools in the Office of Instruction was established and filled.
- The district began publishing a newsletter entitled "The Turning Point" to be distributed to all middle-grade educators in the district which features articles on how to implement middle grade reform, articles describing the district position and emphasis on middle grade reform, and examples of successful middle grade programs in the district.
- A number of district-sponsored symposia and meetings featured middle grade reform.
- The Junior High Schools' Principals' Organization, an organization whose members consist of all principals of middle and junior high schools in the district, began to focus its energies on helping schools implement middle grade reforms. They recently issued a survey to assess school needs relative to implementing the recommendations in CIM and to use in a resource guide identifying exemplary programs.
- The Junior High Schools' Principals organization researched the issue of establishing a middle/junior high division within LAUSD and wrote a formal proposal supporting the establishment of such a division.
- A five-year action plan for middle grade reform entitled "Middle Grade Education Action Plan: A Blueprint for Change" was prepared by nearly 40 authors, including the Partnership and Foundation School principals. This plan concretely lays out a plan consistent with the recommendations in CIM for all middle grade schools in LAUSD.

There were both advantages and disadvantages of having all schools associated with the same district. Advantages were that participants all knew

each other prior to the formation of the regional networks and shared the common bond of being associated with the same district. This eliminated the need for participants to spend time getting acquainted. Further, because of formal district involvement there have been substantial changes in district policy and emphases which may affect all 80 schools in the district which serve students in the middle grades. Also, the diffusion of the efforts of the Foundation and Partnership Schools was facilitated by the fact that the principals of all 80 schools serving students in the middle grades in the district are members of the district the Junior High Schools' Principals' Organization; this regularly scheduled meeting provided a natural forum for district-wide dissemination of the successful practices of the Foundation and Partnership Schools.

Disadvantages were that all schools shared the same political pressures and constraints. For example, a teacher labor dispute in year one contributed to a "slow-down" and subsequent strike in year one which may have distracted Partnership Schools from their reform efforts. Participants in other regions frequently commented on the value of diversity in politics, policies and programs represented by the different districts and schools in a network; Region F participants were not exposed to this diversity. Similarly, both principals and teachers in other regions spoke of the pleasure of establishing relationships with professionals outside of their everyday arena; again, Region F participants did not have this same opportunity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A major accomplishment in this region has been to make middle-level reform a district priority. The successful activities and accomplishments observed in this region, however, have not been earned without a struggle. The

turnover in leadership from year one to year two was disruptive and channels of communication between schools and the district were evidently clouded as a result. Trial and error showed that the committees established in year one were not effective; this failure provided valuable information about what worked and what did not. As a result, the new committees this year are reportedly more productive. The following are suggested:

- Work to improve channels of communication between District Office of Instruction and Network schools.
- Continue to lobby for changes in district policies to further improve opportunities for staff development and the implementation of middle grade reform.
- Review and establish district procedures to encourage all schools to implement middle grade reforms at the school site level.
- Increase IHE and other community resource involvement at both the district and the school site level.
- Continue to identify and disseminate successful practices in Partnership Schools to other middle level schools in the district.
- Begin to disseminate successful practices to middle grade schools outside the district.

REGION F

8/7/89

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
HARTE (BRET) JUNIOR HIG	1,148	06-08	1,148	64	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
ADAMS (JOHN) JUNIOR HIG	1,699	07-09	1,164	91	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
BELVEDERE JUNIOR HIGH	2,533	07-09	1,718	132	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
BERENDO JUNIOR HIGH	2,676	06-08	2,676	146	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
EDISON (THOMAS A.) JUNI	2,062	07-09	1,484	108	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
MARKHAM (EDWIN) JUNIOR	1,598	06-09	1,561	85	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
NORTHRIDGE JUNIOR HIGH	937	06-08	937	47	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
PARKMAN (FRANCIS) JUNIO	971	06-08	971	44	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
SOUTH GATE JUNIOR HIGH	4,043	06-08	4,043	193	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12
SUTTER (JOHN A.) JUNIOR	1,467	06-08	1,467	64	LOS ANGELES	592,273	KK-12

112

REGION F

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
HARTE (BRET) JUNIOR HIG	0.0	73.5	26.4	0.1	86.5	93.9	93.9	68.5	80.3
ADAMS (JOHN) JUNIOR HIG	0.1	3.6	95.1	1.3	83.7	.	28.6	.	38.2
BELVEDERE JUNIOR HIGH	0.4	1.3	98.1	0.2	85.1	.	24.0	.	32.0
BERENDO JUNIOR HIGH	0.9	2.5	88.3	8.3	90.2	22.8	22.8	19.4	23.0
EDISON (THOMAS A.) JUNI	0.0	14.6	83.6	1.7	83.2	.	33.9	.	37.7
MARKHAM (EDWIN) JUNIOR	0.3	63.6	35.0	1.1	77.8	84.4	84.4	68.9	84.2
NORTHRIDGE JUNIOR HIGH	30.9	4.6	49.0	15.5	90.0	12.3	12.3	34.6	49.8
PARKMAN (FRANCIS) JUNIO	47.5	16.6	28.1	7.8	90.2	3.4	3.4	57.6	63.1
SOUTH GATE JUNIOR HIGH	4.6	0.9	93.7	0.8	89.0	19.2	19.2	26.0	31.2
SUTTER (JOHN A.) JUNIOR	37.7	22.0	29.0	11.3	89.2	6.7	6.7	57.3	64.1

8/7/89

REGION F

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
HARTE (BRET) JUNIOR HIG	4	4	1	5	8	6	4	4	7
ADAMS (JOHN) JUNIOR HIG	.	.	.	1	1	2	2	1	1
BELVEDERE JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	4	3	5	5	8	6
BERENDO JUNIOR HIGH	4	4	3	2	2	3	2	2	7
EDISON (THOMAS A.) JUNI	.	.	.	1	1	2	1	1	3
MARKHAM (EDWIN) JUNIOR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NORTHRIDGE JUNIOR HIGH	27	47	28	21	16	31	22	29	17
PARKMAN (FRANCIS) JUNIO	36	32	48	37	43	62	54	51	46
SOUTH GATE JUNIOR HIGH	11	9	8	9	8	7	8	9	12
SUTTER (JOHN A.) JUNIOR	17	22	19	14	10	19	20	16	11

114

Appendix G

Region G: **Los Angeles Suburbs**

Background

Region G spans 8,686 miles and includes Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties; the latter two counties border the Pacific Coastline. (Although Los Angeles County is included in this region, the Los Angeles Unified School District described in Appendix F is not represented in this region.) Most schools are in the suburbs of Los Angeles County with one school located in Ventura County. For the most part, schools are clustered closely together.

The 12 partners in this region are located in two counties and are associated with ten school districts. Nine of the ten districts serve students in grades K-12. District enrollments range from 5,110 to 22,545 students. School enrollments range from 506 to 1246, the average enrollment per school being 906. The number of teachers ranges from 22 to 58.

Students in Region G are representative of those in the state overall. They are primarily white (46.7%), followed by Hispanic (34.3%) and Black (8.3%). However, more than half of the students in five schools are Hispanic and more than half of the students in six schools are white. Thus there are noteworthy differences in the students of these schools. Only one school has more than ten percent Black students. In nine out of the 13 schools, the percent of eighth grade students from families receiving AFDC is below the state average. About half of the schools scored in the first quartile on the CAP test and half scored in the fourth quartile.

Description of the Foundation School

Chaparral Middle School enrolls about 1200 students in grades six to eight. The student body is ethnically diverse with about half the students being white

followed by Asian and Hispanic. Located in an affluent community, fewer than one percent of the students are from families receiving AFDC. These schools do well on the CAP test scoring in the 80th and 90th percentile ranges.

The school itself was built to specifically accommodate the middle grade concept; it has been divided into teams since it opened in 1976. Team members are contained in adjacent open-air classrooms and all classrooms open conveniently to a hub consisting of the library and areas of specialized services. The physical layout of the school is ideal for a middle school. Team members are located near one another, share the same group of students, a common preparatory period and serve in a teacher/guidance role. The principal has been with the school since 1976 and has been instrumental in promoting middle grade reform throughout the state. Because of its commitment to middle grade reform and its unique facility, Chaparral is visited regularly. Visitors are given the opportunity to observe a variety of daily processes occurring at the school including cooperative learning, successfully heterogeneously grouped classrooms, and interdisciplinary teams.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinating regional activities, providing vision for the Network
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week

Title:	Regional Coordinator
Position:	Teacher/Assistant principal
Responsibilities:	Coordination of Regional Activities
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week

Title:	Active Learning Special Interest Group (SIG) Coordinator
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate SIG activities; publicity, evaluate regional symposium
Time devoted:	Four hours per week

Title:	Foundation School clerical
Position:	Foundation School clerical
Responsibilities:	Support Regional Activities; clerical
Time devoted:	Sixty hours per year

Title:	Cooperative Learning Special Interest Group Coordinator
Position:	Teacher and Student Staff Resource Advisor
Time devoted:	Two hours per week
Function:	Coordinate activities of cooperative learning special interest group.

Title:	Spencer Kagan
Position:	Independent consultant
Time devoted:	Seventy-five hours total
Function:	Conducts cooperative learning workshops

Title:	Janet Kierstead
Position:	Independent consultant
Time devoted:	Seventy-five hours total
Function:	Conducts Interdisciplinary Teams/Integrated Curriculum workshops

Title:	Tim Murphy
Position:	LA County Office of Education Middle Grade contact person
Time devoted:	Seventy-five hours total
Function:	Conducts and coordinates Active Participation workshops

Title:	Eunice Krinsky
Position:	Independent Consultant, CSU Dominquez Hills Math Project
Time devoted:	Thirty-five hours total
Function:	Conducts equity and excellence in Math Workshops

Title:	----
Position:	Partnership School counselor
Time devoted:	Thirty-five hours total
Function:	Coordinates Drug Free Schools conference for students

Title:	----
Position:	Teacher
Time devoted:	Fifteen hours total
Function:	Coordinates Equity and Excellence in Math workshop

Title:	----
Position:	Partnership School principal
Time devoted:	Forty hours total
Function:	Coordinate program and logistics for the Region G symposium on Equity and Excellence

Committees

Title:	Leadership Team
Members:	Principal and two teachers from each school, COE contact, CDE representative
Function:	Conduct network business
Meeting Schedule:	Four-five times a year

Title:	Integrated Curriculum/Interdisciplinary Teams
Members:	Forty-four teachers and principals
Function:	Pilot and revise interdisciplinary/thematic units
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Active Participation
Members:	Forty-nine teachers and principals
Function:	Providing training to teachers to increase in-house expertise
Meeting Schedule:	Every two months

Title:	Cooperative Learning
Members:	One hundred and fifteen teachers and principals
Function:	Providing training to teachers to increase in-house expertise
Meeting Schedule:	Every two months

Title:	Equity and Excellence in Math
Members:	Thirty-four teachers and principals
Function:	Providing a four workshop series
Meeting Schedule:	Every two months

Leadership by delegation may best describe the approach taken by this Foundation School principal. The effects of this style are seen in the number of individual leaders and staff development committees identified in the region as well as in the number of participants in each of the committees. While committees and teams meet regularly however, principals do not meet separately on a regular basis. This may impede the development of a sense of collegiality among the Partnership School principals. Staff turnover was not a problem in this region; only one Partnership principal took a new position.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. All schools within Region G will organize and implement interdisciplinary teams on-site at a pace which suits the school's needs and/or its partnership plan. All schools will develop the awareness and understanding of the role that interdisciplinary team structure plays in implementing the following key middle school concepts:

   * integrating core curriculum
   * promoting active learning
   * encouraging equal access
   * nurturing at-risk students
   * providing social and academic guidance
   * empowering teachers

2. Professional Growth Committees established at each site will determine professional development activities to foster multi-disciplinary active learning for students. These staff development activities will be focused on but not limited to:

   * active participation workshop series for a trainer of trainers model at three levels of expertise
   * cooperative learning workshop series in a trainer of trainers model at three levels of expertise

3. Members of the Equal Access Special Interest Group will investigate strategies which facilitate the successful heterogeneous grouping of students in math classes and pilot and evaluate these strategies on a limited basis.

4. The Advisory Special Interest Group members will investigate advisory programs, implement programs best suited for the individual school's needs and evaluate the program.

5. Schools within the At-risk Special Interest Group will find and investigate effective programs and personnel which assist students in staying in school by helping them to experience academic, emotional, and social connectedness.

A comparison of the regional goals with the committee structure suggests that actual regional goals are somewhat different from those originally identified. For instance, there is no evidence of direct work in support of the goals for Advisory programs or programs for at-risk students. However, the evidence is strong of very effective work with respect to the goals pertaining to interdisciplinary teaming, active/cooperative learning and equal access in math.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

All staff development opportunities were well publicized and consequently well attended. In January, 1990, Region G hosted a day-long conference on "Excellence and Equity in Education." The 450 attendees from 19 schools listened to keynote speaker Joel Milgram from the University of Cincinnati speak on "An Adolescent View of an Adolescent Day", and "Discipline with Dignity". Two-hour training sessions on a variety of topics (such as Alternatives for Assessment: Critical Thinking, Ideas from the UCLA Math Project, and Peer Coaching) were offered throughout the day, primarily by teachers from Partnership Schools trained specifically on each topic.

The major accomplishment has been the extensive number of days provided in ongoing staff development in interdisciplinary teaming, active participation and cooperative learning and math equity. A day-long session sponsored by the Leadership Team on implementing interdisciplinary teams is one example of training opportunities offered in this region. Participants came to Chaparral to observe practices in integrating core curriculum, cooperative and active learning, and teaming. Visitors were able to speak directly with Chaparral staff during staff preparatory time. This formally scheduled session enabled participants to observe a different situation each period of the day.

Other staff development was provided by COE and IHE personnel. (These persons are identified by name in the leadership section of this appendix.) Through their efforts indepth training was provided for over 150 participants. Cooperative learning training was provided in two levels: beginning and intermediate. Further, a four workshop series (seven hours each session) was offered on equity and excellence in math.

Clearly, Region G's work in providing staff development has been exemplary. A three month schedule of staff development opportunities in the region contained 15 different meetings and workshops. As a result of these staff development efforts, every Partnership School will begin the 1990-91 school year with at least one interdisciplinary team in place; some will have more than one. With such intensive staff development, it seems highly likely that students are already realizing benefits.

Communication Strategies

This region did not produce a newsletter. However, regular communication was accomplished. A vice-principal at the Foundation School had responsibility for communication with the Partnership Schools and maintained ongoing exchanges through distribution of the minutes from meetings, frequent notes and announcements. In year one, a directory of exemplary programs entitled "Resource Catalog" was published. This catalog contained the name and phone number of a contact person with expertise in certain elements of middle grades reform.

Visitations also provided another avenue of communication. The Foundation School hosted numerous visitations, including a region-wide visitation day in year one that brought in 110 visitors. Over 1000 persons have visited the Foundation School over the two year period. In year two, one Partnership School which has an exemplary interdisciplinary team program hosted a second region-wide visitation day that attracted approximately 80 visitors.

Linkages

Close linkages were established with two IHE faculty and a COE consultant since they provided ongoing training to teachers in Region G. A benefit of these linkages is that teachers had direct and personal interactions with these individuals. In other regions, personal relationships primarily occurred

between the Foundation School principal and IHE or COE representations.

One additional linkage worth noting is between the region and a staff member from the Claremont Graduate School who was retained to conduct an evaluation of regional activities. The formal evaluation was conducted to provide feedback to the region on the effectiveness of their activities.

Finally, four non-partnership schools in the region have become actively involved in network activities. This spillover of middle grade reform to non-partnership schools is evidence of the strength of the reform movement in this region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff development has been a focal point in Region G and has resulted in a cadre of skilled teacher-trainers. Further, because of the staff development efforts interdisciplinary teams have been established in at least 80 percent of the Partnership Schools in this region. The following recommendations are suggested:

- Convene regular meetings of regional principals in order to develop both collegiality and a sense of responsibility for regional decision-making.
- Develop an updated directory of exemplary programs and trainers.

8/7/89

REGION G

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
CHAPARRAL MIDDLE	1,052	06-08	1,052	45	LOS ANGELES	11,210	KK-12
ALVARADO INTERMEDIATE	1,125	07-08	1,125	49	LOS ANGELES	19,038	KK-12
ANACAPA MIDDLE	849	06-08	849	39	VENTURA	14,853	KK-12
ARROYO SECO JUNIOR HIGH	891	07-08	891	46	LOS ANGELES	9,447	07-12
EDGEWOOD MIDDLE	506	06-08	506	22	LOS ANGELES	5,110	KK-12
ELIOT MIDDLE	1,246	06-08	1,246	58	LOS ANGELES	22,545	KK-12
GIANO INTERMEDIATE	1,030	07-08	1,030	45	LOS ANGELES	19,038	KK-12
KILLINGSWORTH JUNIOR HI	578	07-08	555	31	LOS ANGELES	20,800	KK-12
LINDERO CANYON MIDDLE	1,112	06-08	1,112	50	LOS ANGELES	8,755	KK-12
LONE HILL INTERMEDIATE	876	06-08	876	41	LOS ANGELES	9,566	KK-12
LUTHER BURBANK JUNIOR H	779	07-09	536	42	LOS ANGELES	11,410	KK-12
ROOSEVELT (THEODORE) JU	1,032	07-09	689	56	LOS ANGELES	22,222	KK-12
SPARKS INTERMEDIATE	714	07-08	714	33	LOS ANGELES	21,367	KK-12

147

148

REGION G

8/7/89

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
CHAPARRAL MIDDLE	57.4	4.8	15.1	22.6	95.9	0.7	0.7	70.9	91.1
ALVARADO INTERMEDIATE	37.8	6.5	30.8	24.9	94.6	.	5.5	.	70.3
ANACAPA MIDDLE	81.4	2.0	12.2	4.4	94.5	3.6	3.6	88.6	91.5
ARROYO SECO JUNIOR HIGH	86.8	1.6	8.1	3.6	94.5	.	0.7	.	93.2
EDGEWOOD MIDDLE	11.7	5.5	77.9	5.0	94.6	19.2	19.2	42.1	57.8
ELIOT MIDDLE	21.2	45.2	30.4	3.2	0.0	17.1	17.1	64.0	76.5
GIANO INTERMEDIATE	12.7	8.3	64.4	14.7	93.3	.	12.8	.	49.8
KILLINGSWORTH JUNIOR HI	27.7	4.3	62.6	5.4	89.6	.	18.7	.	53.9
LINDERO CANYON MIDDLE	87.0	1.0	2.9	9.2	95.0	0.4	0.4	99.0	97.6
LONE HILL INTERMEDIATE	67.1	7.2	17.2	8.4	93.3	7.0	7.0	85.2	94.6
LUTHER BURBANK JUNIOR H	56.7	0.9	37.1	5.2	92.2	.	6.8	.	70.0
ROOSEVELT (THEODORE) JU	30.4	1.4	50.3	17.9	93.0	.	19.3	.	29.5
SPARKS INTERMEDIATE	12.3	3.6	79.6	4.5	92.3	.	13.2	.	44.9

8/7/89

REGION G

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
CHAPARRAL MIDDLE	90	90	79	81	85	89	84	86	86
ALVARADO INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	69	74	71	73	50	81
ANACAPA MIDDLE	84	71	75	86	84	83	90	85	76
ARROYO SECO JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	76	82	82	78	84	87
EDGEWOOD MIDDLE	20	21	50	17	17	19	17	14	18
ELIOT MIDDLE	17	12	14	31	30	21	27	20	41
GIANO INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	32	26	24	26	22	36
KILLINGSWORTH JUNIOR HI	.	.	.	22	20	23	19	22	24
LINDERO CANYON MIDDLE	87	93	90	94	96	95	96	92	96
LONE HILL INTERMEDIATE	55	52	61	67	68	50	76	69	50
LUTHER BURBANK JUNIOR H	.	.	.	58	57	57	65	58	61
ROOSEVELT (THEODORE) JU	.	.	.	16	18	27	22	23	26
SPARKS INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	16	15	13	13	11	22

Appendix H

Region H: South Bay/Monterey

Background

Region H extends from the San Francisco Bay Area to San Luis Obispo County along the central coast, encompassing five counties. The region covers 13,174 square miles; however, half of the partners are located in the metropolitan area of Santa Clara County. Despite the geographical spread of the region, the maximum driving time between any two schools is not likely to exceed two and one-half hours.

The 12 partners in this region are located in four counties and are associated with 11 school districts. Four are K-12 districts, one is a 7-12 district, and seven are K-8 districts. The school enrollments range from 448 to 1364 students, with the average enrollment being 758. The number of teachers per school ranges from 28 to 69.

There are two major ethnic groups in Region H, white (43% compared with the statewide average of 50.1%) and Hispanic (35.6% compared with the state average of 30.1%), although several schools also have high proportions of Asian students. Asian students in three schools represent from 30 percent to 40 percent of the students. The percentage of students from families receiving AFDC is lower than the state average in nine out of the 12 schools. However, in one school, 41 percent of the students were from families receiving AFDC.

Most students in Region H performed quite well on the CAP test. Seven out of the 12 schools scored in the third or fourth quartiles. Only two schools scored in the first quartile.

Description of Foundation School

Burlingame Intermediate School enrolls about 500 students in grades six to

eight. Most of these students are white (73%) and only about one percent are from families receiving AFDC. Students in this school perform very well on the CAP test with the lowest subscale score being at the eighty-first percentile. The school is clean and spacious and is located on a hill overlooking the bay in an upper middle class suburb of San Francisco.

Middle grade reform is a familiar theme at this school. A number of school programs stand out as exemplary at Burlingame. For example, students in the sixth grade are scheduled into an exploratory "wheel" consisting of a variety of short courses designed to capture the student's interest followed by elective courses in the seventh and eighth grades. An advisor/advisee program has also been implemented with a curriculum designed to enhance student self-esteem, communication, assertiveness and problem solving. Interdisciplinary teams had been recently implemented as well. In 1988, Burlingame was selected as a California Distinguished School by the California Department of Education.

In 1985, the school was selected by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development in Washington D.C. as one of 25 middle grade schools in the nation whose staff participated in a consortium to study and publish a paper on middle grade reform. The principal has been at this school for ten years and is a State Board Member in the California League of Middle Schools.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School Principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Six hours per week

Title:	Newsletter Coordinator
Position:	Foundation School Language Arts Teacher
Responsibilities:	Prepare newsletter
Time devoted:	Six hours per quarter
Title:	Conference Representative
Position:	Foundation School LA Teacher/Advisor
Responsibilities:	Plan and assist in network conference
Time devoted:	
Title:	Telecommunications Consultant
Position:	Foundation School Science/Health Teacher
Responsibilities:	Provide training on telecommunications/set-up and monitor system
Time devoted:	Eight days per year
Title:	Chair, Drug Education Committee
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Facilitate Drug Education Program, including proposal writing
Time devoted:	?
Title:	Assistant Network Coordinator
Position:	Partnership School principal
Responsibilities:	Plan and coordinate planning meeting; assist with conference; assist Foundation School principal
Time devoted:	
Title:	COE Liaison
Position:	Santa Clara COE
Responsibilities:	Four Newsletters per year; coordinates annual conference
Time devoted:	

Committees

Title:	Steering Committee
Members:	All Partnership School principals; representatives from four COEs; IHE representative
Function:	Plan and implement regional objectives
Meeting Schedule:	Four times per year
Title:	Planning Committee
Members:	Three staff from each Partnership School
Function:	To increase knowledge about middle grade reform and to take the knowledge back to their home schools
Meeting Schedule:	Three times per year
Title:	Drug Education Committee
Members:	Representatives from Partnership Schools
Function:	To plan and implement 1-day workshops for students on substance abuse and self esteem
Meeting Schedule:	As needed

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. The network will provide resources for written materials relating to the essential elements of the middle level education.

2. The network will assist in providing access to and financial assistance for consultants for staff development in the essential elements of middle level education.

3. The network will coordinate a regional conference that provides information on these essential elements of a middle school.

4. The network will assist in coordination of school site visitations to sites that have effective programs.

5. The network will provide a quarterly newsletter.

6. The network will assist in developing a telecommunications system for easy exchange of information.

7. The network will provide assistance in assessing staff and educational community knowledge of the essential elements of middle level education and the application of this knowledge to the education program.

8. The network will initiate a meeting between the network steering committee and district Superintendents to increase their knowledge and understanding of the network.

9. The network will provide a minimum of two Planning Team meetings for 3-4 members from each school site.

10. The network will assist in providing consultants on motivational factors for change.

11. The network will facilitate visitations to network sites that have created positive change environments in their schools.

12. The network will assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the change process throughout the network and in partnership schools.

13. The region will work to promote collaboration with institutions of higher education in Region "H" resulting in greater awareness of network and institution efforts in middle level education.

14. The network will develop a regional plan for substance abuse that results in positive change in student attitude toward use of alcohol, drugs, and tobacco.

15. The network will assist Foundation/Partnership schools in developing knowledge and skills to assess equal access within their total school program using the PQR document as a model.

16. The network will assist Foundation/Partnership schools in developing effective group practices that promote equal access to the common core curriculum for all students.

17. The network will assist Foundation/Partnership staffs to refine/develop instructional strategies that promote equal access to the common core curriculum for all students.

Unlike other regions, Region H systematically added to their list of objectives throughout the two year period. The objectives are very task specific and a review of them provides a good summary of regional activities.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

A regional conference was held in January, 1990 and attended by 300 regional educators. The theme of this conference was Middle Grades: "Where the Action Is." Dr. Neila Connors, the keynote speaker, spoke on "The Many Roles of the Effective Middle Level Teachers." Breakout sessions followed the keynote presentation.

Three times a year Planning Committee members (consisting of three representatives from each school) convene for a day-long training session. Topics of training have included interdisciplinary teaming, implementing exploratory wheels, and advisor-advisee programs. Presentations are made by Partnership School staff. The steering committee also meets six times a year to plan and monitor activities. A topic relating to the essential elements of

a middle school is discussed in some detail at each steering committee meeting, thus adding a staff development component to this meeting.

Staff and student development was provided for one staff and four students of each Partnership School during a three-day peer-counseling conference. Staff learned how to train student counselors and students went through leadership training activities. A two-day follow-up conference was subsequently held in the region.

Staff development was also provided in two sessions for school activity directors. The purpose of these sessions was for staff to share activities at their schools and to plan a workshop for student leaders. This workshop has provided information on how to increase the scope of activity programs offered at schools and to prepare students to assume leadership roles in planning school activities. Students at ten out of twelve schools met for the one-day workshop; each school was responsible for facilitating part of the workshop. Finally, an inservice was conducted for yearbook advisors on how to work with middle school students in preparing a yearbook.

Communication Strategies

A functional telecommunications system was established by the end of year one. This system is currently being used by all 12 schools on a regular basis to send and receive messages regarding network activities.

The Region H newsletter is published quarterly and distributed to all teachers in the region. The newsletter format highlights positive programs and practices and gives the name and phone number of the contact person for each program.

Visitations among schools have occurred frequently in this region. The Foundation School has a long history of hosting visitors, but now Partnership

Schools share the spotlight as well. In one instance, nine teachers from one Partnership School toured all region schools during a one-week period. Having observed the best in each school they returned to their own school to begin to implement changes.

Finally, information about Region H has been systematically shared through presentations to professional organizations and community groups. A seminar on substance abuse and self-esteem has been developed for students and staff. This seminar is being presented at each school.

Linkages

The Foundation School had a collaborative relationship with a professor of secondary education at San Francisco State University prior to the creation of the regional network because of a student teacher program. This relationship intensified, however, with the revision of the student-teaching program according to a proposal entitled, "Preparing Credential Candidates to be Effective as Middle School Teacher/Advisors". The IHE representative has continued to be a strong influence in this region.

Supportive relationships with COE representatives have also been established and maintained. Also, because of the Foundation School principals' affiliation with the California League of Middle Schools, connection with professional organizations has been strong.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region H has accomplished a great deal in terms of network functioning (e.g., newsletters and visitations) in large part due to the efforts of the Foundation School staff. However, the focus has been on network processes to the exclusion of site-level program improvement. Future efforts might involve establishing committees to address substantive middle school reform issues. It

is recommended that the region:

- Form committees to work on site-level improvements.
- Focus efforts on specific site-level improvements such as establishing interdisciplinary teams or advisory programs.
- Develop a directory of exemplary programs.
- Continue to maintain linkages with community resources and professional organizations.

REGION H

8/7/89

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
BURLINGAME INTERMEDIATE	495	06-08	495	25	SAN MATEO	1,576	KK-08
CUNHA (MANUEL F.) INTER	610	06-08	599	33	SAN MATEO	2,900	KK-12
EL SAUSAL JUNIOR HIGH	1,364	07-08	1,364	69	MONTEREY	8,286	07-12
FAIR (J. WILBUR) JUNIOR	995	06-08	995	57	SANTA CLARA	9,099	KK-08
HYDE INTERMEDIATE	516	06-08	516	29	SANTA CLARA	10,916	KK-08
MCKINLEY INTERMEDIATE	676	07-08	675	42	SAN MATEO	6,956	KK-08
MONROE MIDDLE	718	05-08	517	36	SANTA CLARA	6,082	KK-12
NEW BRIGHTON MIDDLE SCH	648	06-08	648	34	SANTA CRUZ	1,320	KK-08
RAYMOND J. FISHER JUNIO	448	07-08	448	28	SANTA CLARA	1,942	KK-08
SHEPPARD (WILLIAM L.) M	720	06-08	689	35	SANTA CLARA	15,455	KK-08
SYLVANDALE JUNIOR HIGH	973	06-08	973	54	SANTA CLARA	9,099	KK-08
WASHINGTON JUNIOR HIGH	1,182	07-08	1,182	57	MONTEREY	65,969	KK-12

8/7/89

REGION H

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
BURLINGAME INTERMEDIATE	72.7	1.6	9.7	15.9	93.1	1.1	1.1	66.4	91.9
CUNHA (MANUEL F.) INTER	83.9	0.8	11.6	3.6	94.1	1.8	1.8	87.6	87.4
EL SAUSAL JUNIOR HIGH	9.2	1.5	84.2	5.0	90.4	.	20.4	.	30.8
FAIR (J. WILBUR) JUNIOR	12.4	7.4	42.0	38.2	93.5	41.0	41.0	25.1	47.9
HYDE INTERMEDIATE	75.6	1.7	5.6	17.1	94.7	.	2.7	.	85.5
MCKINLEY INTERMEDIATE	46.6	3.4	41.3	8.7	93.4	.	2.3	.	73.3
MONROE MIDDLE	63.9	6.1	14.6	15.2	94.2	10.6	10.6	84.9	77.7
NEW BRIGHTON MIDDLE SCH	87.2	0.9	9.0	2.9	98.6	6.1	6.1	88.6	93.9
RAYMOND J. FISHER JUNIO	87.9	0.7	3.1	8.2	94.5	.	1.3	.	100.0
SHEPPARD (WILLIAM L.) M	13.5	6.7	48.3	31.5	92.9	12.9	12.9	57.1	49.5
SYLVANDALE JUNIOR HIGH	18.1	8.0	39.2	34.7	92.9	21.1	21.1	48.4	58.8
WASHINGTON JUNIOR HIGH	45.5	4.2	35.9	14.4	91.6	.	10.7	.	75.3

REGION H

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
BURLINGAME INTERMEDIATE	81	96	91	84	92	93	91	84	95
CUNHA (MANUEL F.) INTER	51	50	72	72	72	80	83	88	85
EL SAUSAL JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	14	13	21	17	23	13
FAIR (J. WILBUR) JUNIOR	14	16	21	18	17	23	18	19	33
HYDE INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	84	89	91	91	91	90
MCKINLEY INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	26	36	39	36	30	49
MONROE MIDDLE	61	77	66	64	50	59	62	55	60
NEW BRIGHTON MIDDLE SCH	61	74	67	72	78	74	85	80	88
RAYMOND J. FISHER JUNIO	.	.	.	92	92	95	96	96	91
SHEPPARD (WILLIAM L.) M	32	36	39	28	42	38	31	23	21
SYLVANDALE JUNIOR HIGH	30	38	40	41	50	34	43	41	43
WASHINGTON JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	51	54	50	56	70	54

136

Appendix I

Region I: **East Bay/San Joaquin**

Background

A relatively small region, Region I is composed of Contra Costa, Alameda and San Joaquin counties and spans 1,622 square miles. Schools in this region are closely clustered with driving time between any two schools not exceeding one and one-half hours.

The 11 partners in this region are located in three counties and are associated with eight school districts. Seven of the districts enroll students in grades K-12 and one district enrolls students in grades K-8. Schools in this region are moderate in size with enrollments ranging from 347 to 1062, the average enrollment per school is 639. The number of teachers per school ranges from 15 to 44. The students in this region are primarily white (74.2%) and are from middle to high-income families. Four of the 11 schools exceed the state averages for Black and Asian students. While the percentage of students from families receiving AFDC in two schools exceeded the state average, the percentage of such students in all other schools in this region was well below the state average. Students in this region scored exceptionally well on the CAP test. Test scores at most schools were in the third or fourth quartile, although one school had scores in the second quartile.

Description of Foundation School

Located in a wealthy suburb 40 miles east of San Francisco, Los Cerros Middle School enrolls about 850 students in grades six to eight. The vast majority of students are white (89%) and no students are from families receiving AFDC. The students in this school scored at or above the 90th percentile on the CAP tests.

Los Cerros has a number of exemplary programs which distinguish it. Academic achievement is a high priority at this school. Sixth grade students are assigned to a three-period core class devoted to language arts, reading and social studies; exploratory classes are also part of the 6th grade students day. Seventh and eighth grade students attend departmentalized classes.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Chairperson, Steering Committee
Position:	Foundation School principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinate regional activities
Time devoted:	Four hours per week

Title:	Assistant
Position:	Foundation School assistant principal
Responsibilities:	Support regional events; write for newsletter, plan for regional activities
Time devoted:	Thirty minutes per week

Title:	Special COE Consultant
Position:	Private consultant hired by COE
Responsibilities:	Assist with budget, proposal writing, document preparation, linkages, committee support
Time:	Thirty-five days per year (provided by the Contra Costa COE)

Committees

Title:	Steering Committee
Members:	All Partnership principals, three COE liaisons, alumni principals
Function:	Monitor all regional activities
Meeting Schedule:	Five to six times per year

Title:	Staff Development Committee
Members:	Two principals, COE consultant, three to four teachers
Function:	Plan staff development in the areas of advisement, core curriculum and at-risk students
Meeting Schedule:	Monthly

Title:	Symposium Committee
Members:	Principals, COE liaisons, teachers, Director of the UC Berkeley SUPER project
Function:	To plan "SUPER Saturday"
Meeting Schedule:	Four to five times each fall

Title:	Newsletter Committee
Members:	Principals, teachers, three COE liaisons
Function:	Two regional newsletters per year
Meeting Schedule:	Four times per year

Title:	Resource Directory Committee
Members:	One principal, one COE liaison, IHE representative (University of the Pacific in Stockton)
1989-90 Function:	To produce directory of implemented programs
Meeting Schedule:	Variable, as needed

Title:	Drug Free Schools Committee
Members:	Principals, teachers, one COE representative, parents (30)
1989-90 Function:	Prepare drug free schools proposal and plan regional activities
Meeting Schedule:	Five times per year

Region I is an example of effective delegation of responsibilities. Teachers are involved in several committees as are COE and IHE representatives. This region experienced some significant staff turnover with six Partnership principals taking new positions in the second year. As an indication of the collegiality in this region, however, a number of principals who moved to non-partnership schools or to district office positions continued to attend the Steering Committee meetings regularly. These individuals were called alumni principals and they retained their active involvement in the region. Also, new Partnership principals reportedly quickly involved themselves in regional committees and leadership.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. By 1992-1993, Region I Partnership Schools will provide all students with equal access to common interdisciplinary core curriculum programs linked to the state frameworks emphasizing inter-relatedness of knowledge and skills across subject areas.

2. By 1992-1993 all participating schools shall have implemented and evaluated an advisement program for all students. The program will enhance the intellectual, physical, psychological, social and "moral/ethical" (CIM page 148), and emotional (CIM page 20) development of each adolescent.

3. By 1992-1993, Region I schools will have implemented programs which systematically
   - identify students at risk
   - identify available resources
   - provide appropriate interventions
   - monitor students' progress.,

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Each year the schools in Region I, in conjunction with the University of California, Berkeley, sponsor a day-long symposium in January called "SUPER Saturday". The first year, the conference was attended by 300 regional educators who were able to choose among 17 breakout sessions in addition to listening to a keynote speech by Miles Myers, the co-founder of the Bay Area Writing Project and current president of the National Council of Teachers of English. In the second year, the conference attracted 440 educators who had a choice of 18 breakout sessions; the keynote speaker was Phil Daro, the executive director of the California Mathematics Project.

In addition to the conferences, the Staff Development committee plans and provides inservices for principals and teachers, and presents hands-on practical activities for school personnel. Topics this year followed regional objectives: advisement, heterogeneous grouping and at-risk students. These inservices were

provided in conjunction with the network business meetings. The inservices were provided in the morning and the steering committee meeting took place in the afternoon.

Additional opportunities were provided by Alameda and Contra Costa county offices through the provision of three free scholarships per Partnership School for participation in county-sponsored training. Training opportunities included sessions on the new frameworks, cooperative learning and specific content areas.

Also, through the collaborative services of the Contra Costa County Alameda and San Joaquin Offices of Education, a document containing abstracts and a bibliography of Middle Grade Advisement References was published and distributed. This document provided valuable information to schools wishing to implement an advisory program. This document was distributed to all schools with middle grades in Region I.

Communication Strategies

Region I has taken a number of steps to facilitate communication not only among Partnership Schools but among all schools in the region. As a first step, a one-page folded document entitled "Quick Facts" was published which described basic facts about the state middle grade reform program, the Region I mission and participants, and names and phone numbers of contact persons.

The Region I newsletter, called "The Middle Grades Messenger", is published two times a year and distributed to each teacher in Partnership Schools. Five issues are also sent to each nonpartnership school in the region. This newsletter provides information on network activities and accomplishments relative to regional objectives and profiles reform activities in Partnership Schools. Very professional in appearance, this newsletter could serve as a model for other regions.

In addition, a directory of all 124 schools in the three county region that have implemented reforms has been developed which serves two purposes. First, it documents that schools are implementing the recommendations in CIM. Second, it provides information to encourage visitations among all 124 middle grade schools in the three counties making up the region. This directory was distributed to all schools serving middle grades in Region I.

Linkages

Region I has received considerable assistance from its three COEs, especially the Contra Costa COE which is associated with the Foundation School. This COE donated 30 days of consultant and staff time per year toward brokering for in-kind support, publication of the newsletter, development of the regional budget, organization of the SUPER Saturdays, compilation of the directory and advisory program references, and as a committee/activity resource. This COE also provided access to the county office mailing systems. Consequently all regional products (newsletters, the directory, the advisory reference, and symposium invitations) were sent to all schools with middle grades in all three counties, as well as to district offices and IHEs. Two COEs also extended three free scholarships to ongoing professional development programs and training opportunities to each Partnership School. The third COE, containing only one Partnership School, assists in the publication of the regional newsletters.

Relationships with IHEs have also been established. A faculty member from University of the Pacific is assisting with the compilation of the directory of exemplary programs. This process involved surveying all schools and establishing a computer database. The University of California at Berkeley is actively involved with Region I in sponsoring and hosting the SUPER Saturday.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region I has done an excellent job in terms of building a committed working network, as evidenced by their successful relationships with three COEs and two IHEs and by the continued involvement of principals no longer associated with Partnership Schools. Continuation of their current efforts and implementation of the following recommendations will further contribute to a successful region.

- Look for ways to increase the participation of non-administrative personnel in staff development opportunities in the region.
- Continue offering inservice opportunities in conjunction with business meetings.

REGION I

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
LOS CERROS MIDDLE	793	06-08	780	37	CONTRA COSTA	15,245	KK-12
ALBANY MIDDLE	586	06-08	586	37	ALAMEDA	2,450	KK-12
BANCROFT JUNIOR HIGH	627	07-09	434	35	ALAMEDA	6,137	KK-12
BRET HARTE INTERMEDIATE	529	07-08	508	32	ALAMEDA	18,429	KK-12
HARVEST PARK INTERMEDIA	1,062	07-08	1,051	52	ALAMEDA	8,900	KK-12
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	347	KK-08	102	15	SAN JOAQUIN	21,553	KK-08
PINE HOLLOW INTERMEDIAT	778	07-08	761	44	CONTRA COSTA	31,246	KK-12
PINE VALLEY INTERMEDIAT	772	07-08	760	41	CONTRA COSTA	15,245	KK-12
RIVERVIEW MIDDLE	539	06-08	510	37	CONTRA COSTA	31,246	KK-12
STONE VALLEY ELEMENTARY	463	04-08	355	25	CONTRA COSTA	15,245	KK-12
WILLARD JUNIOR HIGH	541	07-08	541	36	ALAMEDA	7,938	KK-12

144

8/7/89

REGION I

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
LOS CERROS MIDDLE	89.4	1.6	[illegible]6	8.4	95.1	0.0	0.0	95.7	96.7
ALBANY MIDDLE	58.5	14.3	8.5	18.5	94.5	2.5	2.5	75.0	84.3
BANCROFT JUNIOR HIGH	67.5	7.8	11.6	13.0	93.3	.	5.7	.	84.8
BRET HARTE INTERMEDIATE	54.8	20.6	16.3	8.4	93.0	.	8.4	.	90.7
HARVEST PARK INTERMEDIA	90.0	1.2	4.5	4.3	99.2	.	0.8	.	98.2
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	76.1	1.2	17.6	5.2	98.1	7.7	7.7	96.9	87.1
PINE HOLLOW INTERMEDIAT	87.7	1.7	3.9	6.8	94.7	.	1.4	.	92.4
PINE VALLEY INTERMEDIAT	83.7	1.9	4.4	9.9	95.1	.	0.5	.	99.4
RIVERVIEW MIDDLE	58.8	12.2	18.4	10.7	92.0	23.1	23.1	76.1	80.0
STONE VALLEY ELEMENTARY	89.8	0.9	3.5	5.8	95.9	0.0	0.0	90.3	95.8
WILLARD JUNIOR HIGH	32.3	51.0	4.1	12.6	95.2	.	28.0	.	93.0

REGION I

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
LOS CERROS MIDDLE	94	90	90	97	97	94	95	97	95
ALBANY MIDDLE	80	89	94	75	76	91	89	79	78
BANCROFT JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	83	89	77	77	72	83
BRET HARTE INTERMEDIATE	.	.	.	70	62	65	65	67	71
HARVEST PARK INTERMEDIA	.	.	.	90	89	91	85	89	92
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY	91	64	55	69	57	62	65	80	75
PINE HOLLOW INTERMEDIAT	.	.	.	85	84	87	85	83	88
PINE VALLEY INTERMEDIAT	.	.	.	96	94	92	91	96	91
RIVERVIEW MIDDLE	39	45	26	48	32	35	39	49	32
STONE VALLEY ELEMENTARY	95	94	89	99	98	98	97	98	99
WILLARD JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	69	61	80	74	63	82

Appendix J

Region J: North Coast

Background

Region J spans 12,754 square miles and eight counties, runs from the San Francisco Bay area up the coast to the Oregon border, and includes the wine country, Mendocino and Redwood National Park. While eight schools in this region are located in relatively close proximity, four schools are highly isolated. Driving time between the two most distant schools in this region would exceed six hours in good conditions.

The 12 partners in this region are located in five of the eight counties in the region. As might be expected with such a diverse region, they are associated with a number of different district configurations: six K-12 districts, five K-8 districts, and one 7-12 district. Districts in this region are small with the largest enrolling 12,242 students and the smallest enrolling 308 students. Because half of these schools are located in rural areas, there are a wide variety of school configurations: five to eight, six to eight, seven and eight, K-seven, K-eight, and seven to twelve. Schools enroll between 68 and 837 students with the average school enrolling 382 students. This is the lowest enrollment of any region in the state.

Most students in Region J are white (83% compared with the state average of 50%). Only eight percent of the students are Hispanic compared with 30 percent statewide. The percentage of eighth grade students from families receiving AFDC is lower than the state average of 13.6 percent in all schools, except one. In general, students did well on the CAP test. Most students had scores that fell in the third quartile or the low end of the fourth quartile. Two schools had scores in the ninetieth percentile range.

Description of the Foundation School

Silverado Middle School, located in the Napa Valley, is an open-air campus which overlooks wooded hillsides and pastures. Over 800 students in grades seven and eight attend the school. Most of the students are white (77%) and very few are from families receiving AFDC (8%). In general, the students do relatively well on the CAP test.

Reform began at Silverado long before being designated a Foundation School. When the school shifted from a junior high (7-9) to a middle grade format (7-8) about eight years ago it implemented school-wide interdisciplinary teaming, fully embracing the school(s) within a school philosophy. This highly successful change was only one of the reasons that Silverado was awarded the title of California Distinguished School in 1986.

Middle grade reform is the pivot point of all activities at this school. One publication is an excellent example of the creative and enthusiastic methods used to promote middle grade reform in the school. Entitled, "What's Cooking at Silverado?", the 15 page booklet intersperses "recipes" for effective reform with actual food recipes. Examples of "recipes" for reform include Peachy Principal Pie (ingredients of effective leadership are listed), Staff Development Pudding (a concoction which blends elements of core curriculum, teaching excellence and characteristics of young adolescents), and Reform Pie (whose ingredients "translate ideals to reality").

Since being selected as a Foundation School, Silverado has hosted over 300 visitors wishing to observe Silverado's interdisciplinary team structure and other innovative programs. Visitors entering the school are greeted by engraved signs identifying Silverado as a Foundation School and a Distinguished School.

Many visitors come to Silverado because they are interested in implementing interdisciplinary teams at their own school. Silverado assists these schools in achieving their goal; if administrators wish to implement teaming back at their own schools, then their teachers are invited to spend a full day at Silverado. A team from Silverado will then provide follow-up assistance at the visitor's own school site.

LEADERSHIP

Individuals

Title:	Foundation School principal
Position:	Principal
Responsibilities:	Coordinator of Regional Activities
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Foundation School coordinator
Position:	Foundation School school psychologist
Responsibilities:	Supports regional activities; organized regional conferences
Time devoted:	Twelve hours per week
Title:	Foundation School assistant
Position:	Categorical Programs Coordinator
Responsibilities:	Supports regional activities
Time devoted:	Ten hours per week
Title:	Foundation School teacher representative
Position:	Teacher
Responsibilities:	Attends all regional conferences; then shares information
Time devoted:	One hour per week (1988-89)
Title:	Foundation School teacher representative
Position:	Teacher
Responsibilities:	Attends all regional conferences; then shares information
Time devoted:	Three hours per week (1989-present)

Committees

Title:	At-risk Youth/School Culture Subcommittee
Members:	Region principals, teachers and support staff
Function:	Coordinate 2-day conference for students to develop substance abuse leadership skills; plan future activities
Meeting Schedule:	Eight times per year

Title:	Curriculum and Instruction: Language Arts Subcommittee
Members:	Region principals, teachers and support staff
Function:	To plan and provide training sessions on the eight CAP writing domains
Meeting Schedule:	Four times per year
Title:	Curriculum and Instruction: History and Social Science Subcommittee
Members:	Region principals, teachers and support staff
Function:	To plan and provide training sessions on alignment with the frameworks, and on interdisciplinary curriculum
Meeting Schedule:	Sporadically
Title:	Equal Access Subcommittee
Members:	Region principals, teachers and support staff
Function:	To provide training on issues related to equal access (e.g., Heterogeneous grouping)
Meeting Schedule:	Sporadically

While individual leaders are all associated with the Foundation School, Region J has effectively delegated responsibility for the accomplishment of regional objectives through region-wide committees. This diffusion of responsibility contributes to a strong region.

REGIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. Using networking strategies previously described (meetings, newsletter, visitations, etc.), all Partnership Schools shall have implemented a program providing peer, cross-age, advisory, and/or adult assistance and mentor programs designed to meet the needs of at-risk students by 1992-93.

2. Between the 1988 and 1990 school years all Region J Partnership Schools will develop and implement a language arts core curriculum that utilizes a meaning-centered literature approach based on intensive reading, writing, speaking, and listening activities for all students.

3. By 1992-1993, Region J schools will implement an organizational structure, including specific strategies to foster a school culture that enhances the academic experiences and addresses the developmental/maturational characteristics of young adolescents.

4. By June, 1991, all Region J schools will utilize active learning as a key instructional practice in all areas of the curriculum.

Regional objectives focus on substantive change at the school-site level.

A large number of reforms recommended in CIM are addressed in this region.

SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Staff Development

Region J had to overcome a major obstacle that impeded the smooth functioning of its region. The region is large and schools are geographically isolated. It is not an arrangement conducive to networking. The primary method this region selected to help overcome these obstacles was to hold three-day regional meetings at various hotels two or three times a year. (All other regions held monthly meetings, which in most regions, lasted only a few hours.) The principal, assistant principal, and three or four staff from each school would attend; the meetings were scheduled according to a conference format, with multiple presentations throughout the day. Every attempt was made to facilitate communication and friendship among the attending educators; all meals were shared and common social events were planned.

Each meeting focused on a different topic (e.g., equal access, active learning, etc.). During the first year, attention was appropriately focused on sharing the strengths of the Partnership Schools. Partnership School staff would prepare formal presentations which featured programs developed and/or implemented at their schools. In the second year, an increasing number of outside "experts" were called in as presenters. At the final meeting of the second year, featured presenters were from the Department of Education, the National Middle Schools Association, and the California League of Middle Schools.

In addition to the staff development occurring during the regional meetings, a series of regional trainings were offered, including a training for English teachers in the California Writing Project, a series of trainings for history

teachers, and the CLASS project for English, Science and Social studies.

Region J has been particularly strong in terms of providing leadership training for students. Students at one of the Partnership Schools hosted a day-long conference on school issues for student representatives. Five students and the teacher-advisor attended from each school. The topic of the conference was school issues.

A three-day student training program on developing prevention abuse leadership skills was held for ten students and teacher advisors from each Partnership School. The conference was held in a camp in a redwood forest; students stayed in tent cabins. Separate training was provided concurrently for students and teachers on leadership skills, peer assistance programs, and drug and alcohol education. A major outcome of this student conference was the implementation of a peer or adult assistance program at each school. A follow-up training session for adult participants in this conference will be provided in year three. In addition, another student conference is planned for year three on the topic of conflict resolution.

Communication Strategies

The meeting schedule in this region contributed greatly to the communication among its educators. Teachers had the opportunity to become well acquainted over the three-day period of each meeting. In addition, visitations among schools are another avenue for increasing communication. Foundation School staff have already or soon will visit each Partnership School in the region. Visitations among Partnership Schools have been slow, primarily because of the large distances between schools. However, plans are underway to implement a teacher exchange program within the region in year three. In this program, two teachers from different schools would exchange positions for a specified length of time

(e.g., week, month or term).

As described previously, the Foundation School has hosted hundreds of visitors over the past two years. Most of these visitors were from outside the region. However, there were some instances where staff from Partnership Schools visited the Foundation School. In addition, student visitations were arranged between Laytonville, an isolated north coast school, and the Foundation School. Twelve students from the Student Council in Laytonville spent three days at Silverado, attending classes, and sessions on conflict resolution, peer assistance, and school and environmental issues. Student body presidents from the two schools co-facilitated the special sessions. The visitation was coordinated by the Silverado Student Council; the visitors stayed at the homes of Silverado Student Council members.

Initially, newsletters were an effective means of sharing information about the region and the programmatic strengths of each school. Later, there was not as much need for a long newsletter. The option for a telecommunications network has been under consideration in this region, although it has yet to be pursued vigorously. Currently, partners in this region are exploring opportunities for communication via FAX machines. Most educators in this region feel that the FAX would eliminate hours of computer hands-on time and facilitate more appropriate networking.

Linkages

California State University, Sonoma is beginning to work with schools in the region on providing training to improve the History/Social Science curriculum and on implementing middle grade reform in general.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Region J has been highly successful and the result is a cohesive committed Network. Their regional theme, "From the border to the Bay - Region J" is emblazoned on t-shirts and all correspondence. Because of the three-day format of the region meetings and the intensive staff development provided at those meetings, a large number of educators have embraced and begun to implement middle grade reform at their schools. As evidence of the commitment to the concept of a network, partners in this region are not interested in abandoning their network when the three-year project is over. Each school is currently investigating methods of obtaining funding to contribute to the continuation of the network. Evidently Region J is here to stay.

Recommendations for Region J include:

- Investigate the utility of computerized networking and electronic mail system. If determined useful, implement these systems.
- Work to improve the IHE linkage, as well as linkages with other community resources.

8/7/89

REGION J

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	SCHOOL GRADE SPAN	MIDDLE GRADE ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	COUNTY	DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	DISTRICT CONFIGURATION
SILVERADO MIDDLE SCHOOL	837	07-08	837	47	NAPA	2,242	KK-12
ANDERSON VALLEY JUNIOR-	191	07-12	68	10	MENDOCINO	485	KK-12
ARENA ELEMENTARY	297	KK-08	76	14	MENDOCINO	308	KK-08
DEL MAR INTERMEDIATE	282	06-08	282	20	MARIN	850	KK-08
JAMES B. DAVIDSON MIDDL	794	06-08	794	42	MARIN	2,543	KK-08
JEPSON (WILLIS) JUNIOR	1,003	07-09	689	54	SOLANO	10,297	KK-12
LAYTONVILLE ELEMENTARY	345	KK-07	76	22	MENDOCINO	546	KK-12
MIDDLETOWN HIGH	261	09-12	0	23	LAKE	1,215	KK-12
MILLER CREEK MIDDLE SCH	397	06-08	397	23	MARIN	210	KK-08
PETALUMA JUNIOR HIGH	597	07-08	597	33	SONOMA	3,907	07-12
SAN JOSE MIDDLE	526	07-08	520	29	MARIN	7,625	KK-12
SUNNY BRAE MIDDLE	366	05-08	259	20	HUMBOLDT	950	KK-08

8/7/89

REGION J

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL NAME	%WHITE	%BLACK	%HISPANIC	%OTHER	%ATTENDANCE	%AFDC GRADE 6	%AFDC GRADE 8	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 6	%ENGLISH ONLY GRADE 8
SILVERADO MIDDLE SCHOOL	76.5	2.9	15.7	5.0	92.4	.	9.7	.	89.3
ANDERSON VALLEY JUNIOR-	86.9	0.5	11.5	1.0	93.4	.	13.2	.	72.4
ARENA ELEMENTARY	87.2	1.0	2.7	9.0	91.9	12.5	12.5	100.0	94.7
DEL MAR INTERMEDIATE	91.1	2.5	2.5	3.9	98.9	0.4	0.4	87.6	89.3
JAMES B. DAVIDSON MIDDL	66.6	8.9	14.0	10.5	93.6	9.3	9.3	70.8	77.0
JEPSON (WILLIS) JUNIOR	81.4	4.3	10.9	3.5	92.6	.	7.0	.	92.1
LAYTONVILLE ELEMENTARY	81.7	2.3	1.4	14.5	91.6	20.7	.	100.0	.
MIDDLETOWN HIGH	94.6	1.9	1.9	1.6	91.4	.	.	.	.
MILLER CREEK MIDDLE SCH	89.7	1.5	2.0	6.8	94.8	0.2	0.2	92.2	98.3
PETALUMA JUNIOR HIGH	90.3	1.3	5.2	3.2	0.0	.	3.5	.	94.6
SAN JOSE MIDDLE	86.7	3.4	4.0	5.9	95.0	.	4.4	.	90.3
SUNNY BRAE MIDDLE	87.7	1.9	2.2	8.2	95.3	24.3	24.3	97.7	100.0

REGION J

8/7/89

ACADEMICS - CAP PERCENTILE RANK

SCHOOL NAME	READING GRADE 6	WRITING GRADE 6	MATH GRADE 6	READING GRADE 8	WRITING GRADE 8	MATH GRADE 8	HIST/SOC SCI GRADE 8	SCIENCE GRADE 8	DIRECT WRITING GRADE 8
SILVERADO MIDDLE SCHOOL	.	.	.	67	63	82	66	75	58
ANDERSON VALLEY JUNIOR-	.	.	.	40	34	50	60	71	48
ARENA ELEMENTARY	55	78	73	92	68	88	87	85	70
DEL MAR INTERMEDIATE	92	84	91	98	98	97	97	98	95
JAMES B. DAVIDSON MIDDL	69	82	74	54	65	71	79	78	66
JEPSON (WILLIS) JUNIOR	.	.	.	65	51	71	66	54	57
LAYTONVILLE ELEMENTARY	45	32	26	.	.	.	.	.	.
MIDDLETOWN HIGH	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
MILLER CREEK MIDDLE SCH	86	91	93	95	97	91	97	97	77
PETALUMA JUNIOR HIGH	.	.	.	54	44	62	57	63	64
SAN JOSE MIDDLE	.	.	.	71	62	80	83	84	77
SUNNY BRAE MIDDLE	68	58	66	80	57	56	79	69	50

FRO-209 CR 00681 10-90 75